AN ANSWER TO THOMAS BELS LATE CHALLENG NAMED BY HIM THE DOVVNFAL OF POPERY

WHERIN AL HIS ARGVMENTS are anſwered, his manifold vntruths, ſlaunders, ignorance, contradictions, and corruption of Scripture, & Fathers diſcouered and diſproued:

WITH ONE TABLE OF THE Articles and Chapters, and an other of the more markable things conteyned in this booke.

VVhat controuerſies be here handled is declared in the next page.

By S. R.

Hieremiæ c. 50. verſ. 2.

Capta eſt Babylon confuſus eſt Bel,

Babylon is ſurpriſed, Bel is confounded,

S Cyprian. lib. 4. epiſt. 9.

Amongſt men fallen, and prophane, and out of the Church, from whoſe harts the holy Ghoſt is departed, what other thing can there be then a wicked mynd, deceitful tong, venemous harred, and ſacrilegious lies?

AT DOWAY,
Imprinted by LAVRENCE KELLAM, at the ſigne of the holie Lambe.

M. DC. VI.

Controuerſies handled in this booke.

1. Of the Popes ſupremacie. Article 1. through out.
2. Of the real preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Alter. Article 2. chap. 1. 2.
3. Of the Sacrifice of Maſſe. Art. 2. chap. 3. 4. 5. 6.
4. Of the Popes diſpenſations. Article 3. through out.
5. Of Original ſinne & concupiſcence. Article 4. through out.
6. Of merit of good workes. Art. 8. through out.
7. Of the diſtinction of mortal and venial ſinns, Art. 6. through out.
8. Of the ſufficiencie of the holy Scripture. Art. 7. cap. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
9. Of the difficultie of Scripture. Ibid. chap. 6.
10. Of the vulgar peoples reading of ſcripture in vulgar tonges. Ibid. c. 7.
11. Of the tranſlating of holy Scripture into vulgar tonges. Ibid. c. 8.
12. Of Traditions. Art. 7. chap. 9. 10. 11. 12.
13. Of the authority of late general counſayles. ibid. chap. 13.
14. Of the oathes of Biſhops. Ibid. chap. 14.
15. Of the poſſibility of keeping Gods commandments. Art. 8. through out.

XUM

TO
THE MOST HIGHE
AND MIGHTIE PRINCE,
IAMES
By the grace of God King of great Britanie, France, and Ireland, Defendor of the Faith.

IF S.Paul (Most Gratious Soueraigne) being accused of the whole Synagog of the Iewes, by their Orator Tertullus of diuers heynous crimes, both against Gods and the Princes lawes, found notwithstanding such equitie in the heathen President Festus, as that he answered his aduersaries, that it was not the Romans custome to cõdemne any man before he haue his accusers present, and place to make his answer: and also such fauour at the Iewish King Agrippa his hands, as he both licenced him to speake for him selfe, & afforded him fauorable audience. Much more cause haue your

Act. 25.

The like reporteth Plutarch of K. Alexan. the great. Act. 26.

Maieſties Catholique Subiects, being accuſed of the miniſters by a hyred ſpokeſman Bel, to expect the like, yea greater fauor & equitie at your Graces handes. For if the Romans though Heathens, thought it iniuſtice to condemne any particular man at the clamors of a whole nation, before his accuſers were preſent and his defence were heard? And if King Agrippa, albeit a Iew & perſecutor of Chriſtians, deemed it notwithſtanding a Princes part to geue audience to one accuſed of that Religion which he both hated and perſecuted: How much more wil a Chriſtian Prince forbeare to condemne the vniuerſal cauſe of his Catholique ſubiects at the ſlaunders and outcries of miniſters & one hyred Proctor, before their accuſers be brought face to face, and they haue time and place graunted to anſwer for them ſelues? wherein we ſhal account our ſelues more happy then S. Paul, becauſe we ſhal plead our cauſe, not before a Iewiſh, but a Chriſtian King, & ſuch

He killed S. Iames and empriſoned S. Peter. Act. 12.

ſuch a one as better knoweth the queſtions and cuſtomes of the Chriſtians, then King Agrippa did of the Iewes.

VVherfore ſeeing that of late Thomas Bel (a fugitiue once from Proteſtants religion, as he is now from Catholiques) hath not only accuſed, but alſo malitiouſly ſlādered the vniuerſal Catholique cauſe, in a booke which he hath dedicated to your Maieſtie, & termed it the *Dovvnefall of Poperie*, and withal challengeth, dareth, yea adiureth (in which caſe our B. Sauiour Matth. 26. though with danger of his life made anſwer) al Engliſh Ieſuits, Seminary Prieſts, and (as he ſpeaketh) Ieſuited Papiſts to anſwer him. I haue preſumed vpon your Gratious fauour to accept his chaleng, and am ready to performe it hand to hand, if your Maieſtie graunt licence, and in the meane time, to dedicate to your Name this my confutation of his arguments and ſlaunders. VVherin I ſpeake not for my ſelfe as S. Paul did before King Agrippa, but for the religion of your

owne Progenitors and Predeceſſors, for the faith of our Forefathers, for the cauſe of al Catholiques, and for the good (I dare ſay) of your Maieſties owne perſon & kingdoms. For though
Pag. 17. Bel calumniate Chriſtian Kinges and Emperors with opening the window to al Antichriſtian tyranny, and Ca-
p. 1. 22. tholiques generally, with thinking Chriſt to be killed a thouſand times a day and the like: yet eſpecially he ſlandereth the Popes with vſurping power proper to God, and to depoſe Princes, and diſpoſe of their kingdomes at his pleaſure, therby to alienate your mind from the Sea Apoſtolike. wherin he not onely abuſeth your patiẽce with telling you vntruths, but greatly harmeth and endamageth your ſelfe and Realme, by endeuoring through his falſe ſlanders to auert your minde from the Popes, who haue bene the moſt ancient, moſt aſſured, and moſt beneficial frends, which the Kinges & Realme of England euer had. VVhich thing that I may make manifeſt vnto

Vir Apoſtata prauo corde machinatur malũ, omni tempore iurgia ſeminat. Prouer. c. 6.

your

your Grace, I humbly beſeech you geue me leaue to ſet downe ſome praticular examples of the mutual amitie, kind offices, & benifites, which haue euer bene betwixt the Popes and the Princes of this land. VVherein if I be ſomewhat longer then men in Epiſtles vſe to be, I hope that the varietie and profit of the matter wil make requital.

The loue & benefits of Popes to England and Kings therof.

Not long after the Apoſtolike Seat was ſettled in Rome, S. Peter the firſt Pope, about the 63. yeare of Chriſt came hither (as not only Gretians, but Proteſtants alſo confeſſe) ſtayed here a long time, conuerted many Nations to Chriſts faith, erected Churches, ordered Biſhops, and Prieſts, and being admoniſhed of an Angel, returned from hence to Rome to ſuffer Martyrdome. Neither was this loue to our Countrie extinguiſhed by death, but as he promiſed to ſome, ſo he had it alſo in mind after his death, and miraculouſly aſſiſted it in the greateſt diſtreſſes. So that truly wrote S. Sergius 1. Pope vnto our Kings of Eng-

S. Peter P.

Metaphraſt. tract. de Pet. & Paul. apud Lippoman. Cambden in deſcrip. Britaniæ p. 52. *And Nicephor. as he ſaieth.*

2. Pet. 1.

Malmesbur. lib. 1. Pont. Angl. p. 209.

land almoſt a thouſand yeares agoe, that S. Peter was mindful of them: &
Iugubin. de donat. Cõſt. Pope Alexander 3. to King Henry 2. that England was vnder S. Peters protection euer ſince Chriſts name was glorified there. For when our country about the yeare 611. began to Apoſtatate from the faith of Chriſt, and the Biſhops were determined to forſake the land. S. Perer appearing to Sainct Laurence Arch-biſhop of Canturbury did ſeuerly rebuke and ſcourge him becauſe he would abandon the flocke which I (ſaid S. Peter) cõmitted vnto thee. This miracle is ſo certaine as
Gadvvin in the life of S. Laurence. ſome Proteſtãts confeſſe it, & though ſome others wil not beleue it, becauſe they haue neither ſeene nor put their fingers into S. Laurence his wounds; yet it may ſuffice any indifferent man, that it was auouched by S. Laurence,
lib. 2. hiſt. c. 6. Malmesb. lib. 1. Reg. & lib. 2. Pont. Hunting. l. 3. Marian. A. 693. al. 617. VVeſtman. 616. beleeued by King Edbald & his people, who thereupon returned to the Chriſtian faith, recorded by S. Beda aboue eight hũdred yeares agoe (who wrote nothing but what he knew him ſelfe

ſelfe or receaued from credible men, whoſe hiſtory was approued by the King of his dayes & by the Proteſtants now) and finallie it is conteſted & deliuered by our beſt Chroniclers.

Godwin in life of Rat-win. Cambd. in Britania. p. 11.

Not long before, when the King had built a Monaſterie and Church in honor of S. Peter, where now weſtminſter ſtandeth, S. Peter came from heauen and conſecrated (as by miracle he confirmed) the ſame church, promiſing that there he would heare the prayers of the faithful. VVherupõ King Edward Conſſ: reedified that church of new & choſe it for the place of his ſepulture, whom the moſt of his ſucceſſors haue imitated, and bene there alſo crowned. Authors of this are Abbat Ealred, Malmesburienſis (a man highlie eſteemed of Proteſtants) P. Nicolas *2*. and others. In like maner when England was ſore oppreſſed by the Danes, S. Peter was ſeene of Brithwald a holie B: of winchester, in a viſion to anoint S. Edward Conſſ: King of England, and to fore-

In vit. S. Eduardi. Malmesbur. l. 1. de Pont. See Sauil ep. ad Reg. Elizab. ante Malmesbur. Epiſt. ad Eduard. R. apud Sur. Baron. An. 610.

tel

tel the yeares of his raigne, and the end of the Danish fury, adding withal theſe moſt comfortable words. *The kingdome of England is the kingdome of God.* This teſtifie the foreſaid Ealred, Malmesbury, Polidor, and others. If Proteſtãts obiect againſt my Authors, that they were Papiſts, I muſt confeſſe (but to their shame) that I finde no proteſtãt writer before K. Henry 8. his time: yet ſuch papiſts they are as proteſtants account ſome of them *the ſingular ornamẽts of England, eſpecial friends of truth, and renonmed through Chriſtendom for vertue and learning*, and others they cal *faithful recorders of things done, good and diligent Authors, and moſt true guides of the times paſt.* Such alſo they are, as wrote long before proteſtants were, & therefore not vpon any ſplene againſt them: and finallie ſuch they are, as vpon their authority principallie dependeth al the credit of our Engliſh Chronicles. Others perhaps wil ſay, that the foreſaid hiſtories are not in ſcripture. True: nor almoſt any thing

Loc. cit. Malmesb. lib. 2. reg. cap. 13. p. 91. lib. 8. hiſtor. Angl.

Cambden in Britan. p. 12. & in Durham. Stovv A. 726. Belin dovvneſal p. 54. of S Beda. Bauil of Maſmesbur. Hunting. and Hoveden. epiſt. ante Malmesbur.

XUM

thing els in al our Chronicles. Shal we therefore beleue nothing but what God reporteth? I requeſt no more, but that the foreſaid matters be as wel credited, as other things are, which the ſame Authors report.

This affection and loue towards England was not proper to S. Peter alone, but deſcended vnto his ſucceſſors. For when the ſweet ſound of the Ghoſpel firſt preached here by him, had ſo increaſed, as it came to the eares of Lucius then King of this land, he ſending to Rome for preachers, P. Eleutherius about the yeare 156. ſent hither S. Fugatius and S. Damian, who baptized the King, Queene, and almoſt al his people. VVhereby our Country became the firſt, that publikely profeſſed the faith of Chriſt, and there vpon is called *Primogenita Eccleſiæ*. The like charitable office performed alſo P. Victor vnto Scotland about the yeare 203. ſending thither his legates at the requeſt of King Donaldus, who conuerted the King together

P. Eleutherius A. 156. S. Beda lib. 1. c. 4. Martyr. Rom. 26. Ado & Marian. in chronic. VVeſtmon. A. 188. Stow 179.

P. Victor. 203. Boet. lib. 6. hiſtor. Scot. Genebr. chron. in Victore.

XUM

gether with the Q. and nobility And about the yeare 324. Pope Silueſter hauing perfectlie inſtructed our great Emperor Conſtantin, baptized him, and miraculouſlie cured him of his leproſie, as the ſaid Emp. and many others teſtifie. Afterward when the Chriſtian faith in Britany began to be infected with hereſie, P. Celeſtin about the yeare 432. ſent hither S. S. German and Lupus for to expel and confute the hereſies, which they accõplished. And the ſame P. in the yeare 434. conſecrated Palladius a Biſhop, and ſent him to Scotland, where as yet was no B: & not forgetful of Ireland, ſent thither S. Patrick, who with miracles cõuerted the Iland, & deſerued (ſaith Cambdin) the title of Apoſtle thereof. Thus cõtinued the loue of the Sea Apoſtolicke towards our Coũtrey al the time that the Britõs poſſeſſed it.

P. Silueſter. 324. Conſtant. in edicto Menolag. Græcor. cal. Ion. Hunringt. l. 1. hiſt. p. 306. Acta liberi, vita Silueſtri.

P. Celeſtin. A. 432. Proſper in chron. An. 431. Baron. 429. Proſper An. 434. Beda l. 1. c. 13. Plat. in Celeſtino. Baron. Ann. 429. Cambden in Hibernia. Marian. in chron. Cambd. in Hibern.

But towards our Engliſh nation, after they had conquered this Iland, it was far greater. For whereas not only the Britons refuſed, but the

Beda lib. 1. c. 22.

Fren ch

XUM

French also and other Christian nations neglected, to preach vnto our English aunciters, who euer vntil that time had bene Pagans, & bondslaues (saith S. Beda) of Idols: only Rome put forth hir helping hand to draw thē out of that darcknes & miserie of Infidelity. For no sooner that blessed & holie father S. Gregory (as Gadwin calleth him) vnderstood that the Angles or English (whom for their bewtie and his tender affection he called Angels) were Pagans, but forthwith he went to the P: (being him selfe yet a monke) and desired him to send Preachers into England, and offering him selfe to be one: And obtaining licence came on his voyadge towards England three daies Iourney, but was recalled at the importunity of the Romanes, who were vnwilling to forgoe soe worthie a man, neuertheles he forgot not his holie enterprise. *For as soone* (saith S. Beda l. 1. cap. 1.) *as he was high Bishop ouer the vvhole vvorlde, he made our nation the Church of Christ, which*

Gregor. lib. 5. epist. 58. 59. Gadvvin in *life of S. Austin.*

lib. 2. c. 1.

P. Gregory. An. 596. loc. cit.

Beda lib. 2. c. 1. Malmesb. l. 1. Reg.

Ioan. Diac. in vit. Gregor.

vvhich had bene euer vntil that time the bondſlaue of Idols. And in the yeare 596. ſent hither S. Auguſtin with almoſt forty Moncks more to preach, who being receaued of K: Ethelbert in short time conuerted both him & his Coũtry. And that they preached the true faith and religion of Chriſt, appeared by the miracles they wrought in teſtimony thereof, which were ſo great, and many, *as it ſeemed* (ſaith S. Gregory) *that they imitated the vertues of the Apoſtles* by the miracles they wrought, and are withal ſo certaine, as they are not only teſtified by the ſaid S. Gregory in diuers places, S. Beda & other ancient writers, and by the Epitaph of S. Auguſtins tombe, but cõfeſſed alſo by diuers Proteſtants. Againe in the yeare 601. he ſent more Preachers and with them al things neceſſary for the furniture and ſeruice of the Church, *as holie veſſels* (ſaith S. Beda) *Aultar clothes, apparel for prieſts and Clarcks, reliques of holie Apoſtles and Martirs, and many bookes*, and a Palle to S. Auguſtin

to vſe

Beda ſup. Stovv. An. 596. Godvvin. ſup.

lib. 7. epiſt. 30.

lib. 9. ep 56. 58. Beda lib. 1. c.31. l.2.c.2. Apud Godvvin. in vit. Auguſt. Godvvin. ſup. Stovv An. 603. Cambd. in Britan. p. 204.

Beda lib. 1. c.29.

to vse only (writeth S. Gregory) *at Maſſe*, appointed alſo him to be ouer al the Bishops and Prieſts of Britany, and gaue him licence to inſtitute 24. Bishopricks, whereof 12. should be vnder his prouince, and 12. vnder yorke. Beſides he ſent rich preſents of diuers ſorts, and letters vnto the King and Queene, for to confirme them in their faith: and ſent order alſo into France to buy ſuch English youths as were there ſlaues, and to ſend them vp to Rome there to be brought vp in vertue & learning. VVherein he gaue the example of the English Seminary which not long after, our English Kings founded in Rome. This was the exceeding loue of this B. Pope towards our Nation, *vvhom vve may vvel, and muſt* (ſaith S. Beda lib. 2. c. 1.) *cal our Apoſtle, and may lavvfullie pronounce of him that ſaying of the Apoſtle. Although he vvere not an Apoſtle to others, yet he vvas vnto vs: For the ſigne of his Apoſtleship vve are in our Lord.*

Apud Bed. ſup.

Bed. lib. 1. c. 32. Gregor. lib. 9. epiſt. 59. 60.

Gregor. lib. 5. epiſt. 30.

1. Cor. 9.

Neither was this great good ſo happilie

pilie begun and planted in our nation by S. Gregorie and his Legates, neglected by the Popes his succeſſors, but rather diligentlie watered and furdered by them, as appeareth by the letters & Meſſages of diuers of them ſent vnto our Princes and Bishops to that purpoſe. as of P. Boniface 5. in the yeare 618. of P. Honorius in 633. of P. Agatho 679. P. Zacharie about 746. P. Adrian 789. P. Formoſus 894. and others. But moſt of al it was increaſed by P. Honorius his ſending hither in the yeare 635. that Apoſtolical man S. Birin, who conuerted the weſt Saxons: and by P. Vitalian, who in 668. ſent hither thoſe holie and great learned men S. Theodor and Adrian, by whoſe teaching Englishmen in short time became the rareſt men, and beſt learned of their age, and the firſt founders of the vniuerſities in Paris, and Pauia, and conſequentlie the chiefeſt fountaines of the learning which hath bene ſince in the weſt. After this time Eardulf King of Northumberland, being

Bed. lib. 2. c. 10. 11. Huntingt. l. 3.
Bed. lib. 2. c. 17. Hunting. ſup.
Bed. lib. 4. c. 18. Hunt. l. 4. p. 335.
Malmesbur. l. 1. Pontif. p. 197.
VVeſtmonaſt. A. 789.
Malmesb. l. 1. Reg. p. 47.
A. 804.
P. Honorius An. 635.
Bed. l. 3. c. 7.
Gadvv. in vit. Birini.
P. Vitalian. 668.
Bed. lib. 4. c. 1. 2.
Gadvv. in vit. Theodori.
Antonin. tit. 14. c. 4. paragr. 14.
Lazius l. 3. de Cimmerijs Ramus & Poeta German. apud Cãbd. in Britan. p. 105.
Polid. lib. 5.

being driuen out of his kingdome & countrey, P. Leo 3. in the yeare 808. sent Card: Adalph his legate into England, who with the helpe of Charles the greats Embassadors, restored the King peaceablie vnto his kingdome. Not long after P. Leo 4. dispensed with King Ethelwal for to marry, which he being a Subdeacon could not do lawfullie: & at the same kings request crowned his sonne Alfred King, and adopted him for his sonne. who afterward, for his worthie deeds both in warre & peace was surnamed *the great*, and for al things became the rarest Prince that England (and perhaps Christendom) euer had. Soone after in the yeare 883. at the suite of the King Alfred, the great P. Martin 1. released the tribute which the English schoole or Seminary then in Rome paide, & sent to the King many guifts, among which was a good piece of the holie Crosse.

P. Leo 3. An. 808. Amoinus l. 4. c. 94. Regino in chron. Baron 808.

P. Leo 4. 855. Gatherelin in vit. S. Suithuni apud Sur. Baron. 855.

VVestmonast. 855. Baron. sup.

P. Martin. 1. 883. VVestmonast. & Baron. A. 883. Gadvvin in vit. Pleg-

In the yeare 990, when Richard: Marques of Normandie had purposed

to inuade England, and make warre vpon king Ethelred, P. Iohn 15. sent his Nuncio and letters to take vp the matter, who happilie brought them to agreement: and about the yeare 1059. P. Nicolas the second granted to king Edward Conff. and his succeffors, *aduocationem & tuitionem omniũ totius Angliæ Ecclefiarum*, the aduouzon & protection of al the Churches in Englãd. And in the yeare 1094. P. Vrban 2. in a councel at Bari, appointed that S. Anfelme Archbishop of Canterburie and his succeffors fhould fit in Councels befides the Archdeacon of Rome, who fitteth before the P. adding thefe honourable words *Includamus hunc in orbe noftro tanquam alterius orbis Papam*, wheras before it was vnknowne (faith Malmesbury) what place belonged to our Archibishop; & the fame place did P. Paschal 2. confirme in a councel at Rome about the yeare 1102. But befids this, diuers other dignities haue bene graunted to the Sea of Canturb: by the Popes, as that it fhould be Primate

P. Ihon. 15. An. 990. Epift. apud Malmesb. l. 2. Reg. c. 10. Baron. An. 990.

P. Nicolas 2. 1059. Epift. ad Eduard. R. apud Sur. in vit. Eduardi.

P. Vrban. 2. 1094. Malmesbur. l. 1. Pontif. p. 213 Gadvvin in vit. Anfelmi.

Malmesbur. fup. p. 208. 209.

mate ouer al Britany, and the B: *legati nati*, and other like dignities. Polid.lib.13. Gadvvin in vit. Theobaldi.

Moreouer in the yeare. 1098. the Scottish men (saith Genebrard out of Maior & Boethius two Scottish Chroniclers) obtained of P. Vrban 2. for their Prince, that he might haue the name, title, and anointment of a king (which the Hungarians and Polonians had obtained for their Princes, about the yeare 1000.) whereupon Edgar was then first anointed King of Scotland. And about 1107. P. Pascal 2. writing to king Henry 1. among other things promiseth so to fauor him and his sonne, *as vvho* (saith he) *hurteth you or him may seeme to haue hurt the Church of Rome*. And in the yeare 1152. when K. Steephen (hauing vsurped the Crowne of England) would haue caused the Bishops to Crowne his sõne Eustace, thereby to exclude for euer the right heyre Henry 2. Pope Eugenius 3. sent commaundement to the Cleargie not to medle in that matter, whereby it was hindered. In the yeare

Genebrard. chron. in Vrban.2. Pascali 2. Leone 9.

Baron. An. 1000.

P. Pascal.2. 1107. Malmeshur. lib.5.Reg.p. 163.

P. Eugenius 3.An.1152. Scovv An. 1152. Gadvvin in vit. Theobaldi.

P. Adrian. 4. 1160. Stovv. An. 1160. VVestmon.

1160. P. Adrian 4. gaue vnto King Henrie 2. the dominion and regiment of Ireland, and sent vnto him the Bul of his graunt with a ring of golde in token of the inuestiture: which graūt at the requeſt of the ſaid K. P. Alexander 3. cōfirmed to him & his heyres.

P. Alexander 3. An. 1171. Houeden. p. 1. Annal. p. 523. Polid. lib. 13.

P. Lucius 3. 1185. Houed. p. 2. p. 628.

And as for P. Lucius 3. ſucceſſor to the ſaid Alexander, his good wil appeareth by the great praiſe which he giueth to our English kings, whom he writeth to haue far exceeded the reſt of Chriſtiā Princes in warlike prowes and noblenes of minde. VVhich affection continued alſo in his ſucceſſor

P. Vrban. 3. An. 1185. part. 2. p. 631.

P. Vrban 3. of whom (as Houeden writeth) K: Henry 2. obtained many things, whereof one was that he might crowne which of his ſonnes he would

Stovv. Ann. 1185.

of the kingdome of Ireland, which he confirmed by a bul, and in token of his good wil & confirmation, ſent to him

P. Clement. 3. An. 1189. Hovved. p. 2. pag. 632. VVestmonaſt. A. 1189.

a crowne. And laſtlie P. Clement the third in the yeare 1189. when, not only the French king, but alſo his ſonnes and Nobles had conſpired againſt the

ſaid

ſaid K: & inuaded his dominions with a far greater power then he was able to reſiſt, ſent a Cardinal to exhort them to peace, who excommunicated the hinderers of the peace, and threatned to interdict the French kings countrey vnles he made peace with England.

Likewiſe in the yeare 1193. when K: Richard Ceur de lyon was taken priſoner, as he came from the holie land by the Duke of Auſtria, P. Celeſtin 3. at the K: requeſt excommunicated the D: and enioyned him to releaſe the couenants which he had conſtrayned the K: to make, and to ſend home the pledges: who not obeying the Pope he ſoone after died miſerablie, and was left vnburied vntil his ſonne had ſent home the pledges, and ſworne to ſtand to the iudgemēt of the Church. And in the yeare 1207. P. Innocent 3. ſent to K: Iohn an eloquent Epiſtle and diuers pretious Iewels. And in the yeare. 1215. when the Barons had extorted from the ſaid king certaine

P. Celeſtin. 3. A. 1193. VVeſtmon. Ann. 1193. Stovv 1195. Polid. l. 14.

P. Innocent. 3. An. 1207. Stovv Ann. 1207.

charters and liberties, the P. at the Kings requeſt diſanulled them, and excõmunicated the Barons which had rebelled againſt him, & when the ſaid Barons had called in Lewis the Prince of France, choſen him their King, and yeelded the chiefeſt Cities & holdes into his hands, ſoe that England was in euident danger to be loſt, the P. ſent his Legate to aſſiſt kinge Iohn, and to forbid the French vpon paine of excõmunication to enter into England, which he ſtoutlie performed. Alſo in the yeare 1253. P. Innocent 4. beſtowed the Royal title and right of the kingdomes of Naples and Sicily vpon Edmond ſonne to K: Henry 3; and ſent by a Cardinal the inueſtiture thereof. And 1257. P. Alexander 4. ſent Meſſengers vnto Richard brother to the ſaid king, for to aſſure him of the Imperial dignity and to exhorte him to goe into Germany to receaue it, which he did, and was crowned king of Romans at Aquiſgran. And in the yeare 1292. when the Barons had

Stovv 1195. 1296. 1297. Gadvvin in vit. Steph. Langton. Polid.lib.15. 16.

P.Innocent. 4.An.1253. Co min ventura nella relat.de Napoli. Polid. lib.16.Stovv A. 1254.

P. Alexander 4. Ann. 1257 VVeſtmon. An. 1259.

had wrested out of the said K. hands certaine liberties, P. Vrban 4. at the kings suite, sent a Legate to accurse the Barons that had rebelled in defence of the said liberties.

P. Vrban. A. 1262. Stovv Ann. 1262.1264.

Againe in the yeare 1272. at the request of king Edward 1. P. Gregory 10. excommunicated Guy of Monfort for killing the kings Cooſin German in a church at Viterbo, and condemned him of wilful and priuy murder, of Sacrilledge and treason, declared him to be infamous, and incapable of any office in the commonwealth, and disherited his posterity vnto the fourth generation, and excommunicated al those that intertained him and interdicted their dominions. And in the same kings time was Cambridge of a schoole made an vniuersity by the P. & soone after in the yeare 1311. vnder king Edward the second P. Clement 5. appointed that in Oxford should be read two lectures of the Hebrew, Arabick, and Caldaick tongue, and authorized it for one of the famouſest

P. Gregory 10. An. 1272. VVeſtmon. An. 1272. Polid. lib. 17.

Cambden in descript. Cantabrig. p. 435. ex Remington. P. Clement. an. 1311. Clement. lib. de Magist. c. 1.

P. Ihon. 22. An. 1316. Polid. lib. 17. Stovv. An. 1316.

vniuerſities in Chriſtendome. Alſo in the yeare 1316. P. Iohn 22. at K: Edward 2. his requeſt, ſent two Legates to make peace betwixt England and Scotland, and to reconcile Thomas Earle of Lancaſter to the King, who excommunicated the Scots, becauſe they would not agree to peace. And in the ſame yeare at the kings petitiõ, the P. confirmed al the ancient priuiledges of the vniuerſity of Cambridge, which of long time they had enioyed *by the benefit* (writeth Stow) *of the Popes predeceſſors.*

Stovv. 1317.

P. Innocent. 8. A. 1489. Stovv. Ann. 1486.

Moreouer in the yeare 1489. Pope Innocent the eight ſent a Nuntio to take vp the variance betwixt the King of Scotland and his people, but before his arriual the King was ſlaine. And about the yeare 1504. when there aroſe a contention betwene K: Henry 7. & Ferdinand King of Spaine about the precedence, P. Iulius 2. hauing heard both their Embaſſadors gaue ſentence for the King of England. And in the yeare 1505. ſent to the ſaid King

P. Iulio 2. A. 1504. Valaterran. Comin ventura. Stovv ib.

King a ſword & Cap of maintenance, as to a defendor of the Church. But as no King of Englād deſerued better of the Sea Apoſtolick then K: Henry 8. did for a long time, ſo none receaued more honor from thence then he did. For he receaued not only from P. Iulius 2. in the yeare 1514. a ſword and Cap of maintenance, for defending him againſt the French king; But alſo of Pope Leo 10. in the yeare 1521. the moſt honourable title of *Defendor of the faith*, for defendig by writing the Catholique faith againſt Luther. VVhich title as it is more honorable then the titles of moſt Chriſtian, or Catholique, giuen likewiſe by Popes to the French K: and K. of Spaine: ſo was it euer highlie eſtiemed of K. Henry, and by him cauſed to be engrauen on his tombe, where he left the title out of his Supremacie.

Stovv 1514.

P. Leo 10. A. 1521.

Stovv A. 1521 Onuphr. chron. 1520.

Stovv did ſee it. An. 1547.

And though Q. Elizabeth had vtterly caſt of the Popes friendſhip, yet he forſooke not hir. For Pius 4. ſuppoſing that ſhe had reuolted from that Sea,

P. Pius 4 A. 1560.

Sea, rather for feare leſt her title to the crowne might be called in queſtion, becauſe one P. had before declared her birth, to be vnlawful, then for diſ-
1560. like of the religion which in her father and ſiſters daies ſhe had profeſſed,
1562. ſent a Nuntio to promiſe her al fauor touching her title to the crowne: And ſoone after an other, to requeſt her to ſend her diuines to the Councel of Trent with promiſe of al ſecurity and liberty. Neither may I leaue your Maieſtie out of the number of the Princes of this land, who haue taſted the loue
P. Clement. 8. 1603. & frindſhip of the Sea Apoſtolike: Becauſe out of your owne grateful mind,
Proclamat. Aug. 1603. you haue publiquely profeſſed, your ſelfe behoulding vnto P. Clement 8. for his temporal carriadge, and diuers kinde offices towards your Maieſtie. Beſides he hath (as it is reported) cenſured al ſuch as ſhal moleſt your grace, and hath often times profeſſed that he would willinglie giue his life for the eternal good of our countrey. VVhich is the greateſt loue that one can beare

(as our

(as our Sauiour testifieth) vnto his friend. Oh how great enimies are they vnto England, who seeke by false slaunders to make such freinds odious vnto vs.

By this which hath bene said (omitting much more for breuity) your Maiestie clearlie seeth, how greatlie and how continually the Sea Apostolique hath euer fauored the Christian Princes of this land: how many and how great benefits both spiritual and temporal, Popes haue bestowed vpon them, and in their dangers and distresses according to their power assisted them. VVeigh (I beseech your grace) in the ballance of your Princely wisdome, the forsaid benefits, with such as your selfe or Auncitors haue receaued from the rest of Christendom, and you shal finde that the Sea Apostolicke alone, hath more benifyted England, then al Christendom besides, and consequentlie that the forsaking of the Popes friendship hath more endammaged your Realme, then if it had

Popes haue benefited Engl. more then al Christendome besyds.

had forsaken the rest of Christendom. But especiallie (I humblie beseech your Maiestie) weigh them with such as Bel, or any minister can shew you to haue receaued, from their two seats of pestilence in witenberge and Geneua. VVhat kingdomes haue they bestowed vpon you? vnto what imperial or Royal dignity haue they exalted you? from what Paganisme haue they conuerted your land? what enimies haue they appeased? what assistance haue they afforded you in any need? what good, litle or great haue they brought to this land? Now what mischeefe haue they not brought? That one Apostata, and fierbrand of seditiō Knox, sent from Geneua, brought more mischiefe to your Grandmother, your B. mother, to your father, and Kingdom of Scotland, then I can rehearse, or your Maiestie without great griefe can remember. Ministers pretend the loue of the Ghospel, as the cause of persuading you from friendship with the Pope: But yet

Bel in his owne iudgemēt was both an Apostata and Traitor whiles he was Preist.

dissua-

disswade not from friendship with the Turke. They pretend also your graces security: But the true cause indeed your Maiestie descried & discouered in Knox, to wit their owne security & aduaũcement, which they fear would be endangered, if you kept your ancient, and surest friend, and therefore with your losse (as your maiestie perceaued in your Grandmothers case) they worke their owne wealth and security. And thus much of the Popes.

See Conser. at Hampton Court. p. 80. 81.

As for the Christian Princes of this land, though they haue bene of foure different, and most opposite nations, to wit Britons, English, Danes, and Normans, yet haue they al agreed in keeping the league of friendship with the Pope, being officious vnto him, & accoũting him their especial friend. Of the British kings of this land first is King Lucius, whose particular affection towards the Sea Apostolick, is euident, by that he neglecting other Christian Churches neare vnto him, he sent so far as to Rome for Preachers.

The laue & benefits of the British Kings to the Sea Apostolik. Note this.

K. Lucius A. 156. Bedalib. 1. c. 4.

Constantin Mag. 324.

chers. As for Constantin the great (the immortal glory of the British kings) his extraordinary loue and affection vnto the Sea of Rome is more notorious then I need rechearse. For he not only gaue vnto the Pope the gouernment of Rome, and of a good parte of the west (as besides him selfe, and Latin historiographers, both Greecks and Iewes professed enimies to the Pope do testifie) but also serued him as a lackey houlding his stirrop and leading his horse by the bridle. Cadwallader also the last British king in England, hauing lefte his countrey went no whither but to Rome, and there ended his daies. And if the histories of those anciēt times were more perfect, or the Britons had raigned longer in this Iland, no doubt but we should haue more examples of their deuotion to the Sea of Rome, as appeareth by Salomon their King in litle Britany, after they had bene driuen hence by the Saxons; who writing to Pope Adrian

Constant. in edicto. Isidor. Eugubin de donat. Constāt. Grat. d. 69. Iuo. Genebr. in chron. Photius seu Balsam. in nomocan. R. Abraham in Zikron Dibre Romi. Abben Ezra 11. Daniel. Cadualader. Polid. lib. 3.

Salemon A. 869 Argenteus histor. Brit. lib. 2. c. 17. Biron. An. 569.

drian the ſecond beginneth his letter thus. *Domino ac beatiſſimo Apoſt: ſedis Rom: Hadriano, Salomon Britanorum Rex flexis genibus inclinatoque capite.* And ſendeth him his ſtatua in gold, with diuers rich guifts and money, promiſeth a yearlie penſion, and acknowledgeth his Royal title to haue bene giuen to him by Popes. This was the loue of the British kings vnto the Sea Apoſtolike.

The loue & benefits of the English Kings.

To the Britiſh kings ſucceeded the Saxons or English, as wel in their loue and reuerence to the Sea of Rome, as in their kingdome. For king Ethelbert at the very firſt receaued S. Gregory his Legats very courteouſlie, prouided them of al things neceſſary, and freelie licenſed them to preach, vſing theſe gratious words worthie to be imitated of your Maieſtie in the like caſe. *For ſo much as you are come ſo far to impart vnto vs ſuch knowvledge as you take to be true, vve vvil not trouble you, but rather vvithal courteſie receaue you.* After him king Oſwin ha-

K. Ethelbert An. 596. Beda lib. 1. c. 25.

K. Oſvvin. A. 665.

uing

uing perfectly learned that the Church of Rome (saith S. Beda) was the Catholique and Apostolicke Church, sent thither in the yeare 665. a Priest to be consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. And in a conference about the obseruation of Easter, hearing that the keies of heauen were giuen to S. Peter, concluded thus. *I vvil not gaine say such a Porter as this is, but as far as I knovv and am able, I vvil couet in al points to obey his ordinance. And in the* yeare 670 *he bare* (saith S. Bede) *such loue and affection to the Apostolike Sea of Rome, as if he might haue eskaped his sicknes, he purposed to goe to Rome, and to end his life in those holie places there.*

Lib. 3. c. 29.

Bed. lib. 3. c. 25. Bar. An. 664.

Lib. 4. cap. 5.

But what he could not through death performe, the valiant Prince King Cedwalla did in the very flour of his age and prosperity. For in the yeare 689. *forsaking his kingdome* (saith S. Beda) *he vvent to Rome, thinking it to be a singular glory, and renovvme for him to be regenerated vvith the Sacrament of Baptisme at the Sea Apostolicke. And*

K. Cedualla. An. 689.

Beda lib. 5. c. 7.

vvith-

withal conceaued hope, that as soone as by baptisme he was cleansed from sinne, he should depart from this world to immortal ioy. VVhich by Gods prouidence was perfourmed, and he honourablie buried by the Pope in S. Peters Church. Not long after him, to wit in the year 709. two English Kings Coenred and Offa forsooke their kingdomes, went to Rome, and there became Moncks, *continuing* (saith S. Beda) *at the Apostles tombes in praying, fasting, & dealing almes vntil their dying day.* Ina al. Hun successor to K. Cedwal in his kingdome, succeeded him also in his deuotion to the Sea Apostolike, *for after he had raigned* (saith S. Beda) *37. years he gaue ouer his kingdome, & went him selfe to the tombs and monuments of the Apostles in Rome, as in those daies many English both of the Nobility and Commons, spiritual and temporal men and woemen were wont to doe with great emulation.* Neither went he only to Rome, but became there a Monke, and was the first that paied the Peter pence, appointing that euery

K. Coenred and Offa. 709.

Lib. 5. cap. 19. Baron. 709. Huntingt. l. 4. p. 357. Malmesb. l. 1. reg. c. 6. Marian. chron. VVestmonast. 710. Sigeb. 707. Polid. lib. 4. Fox. l. 2.

K. Ina. An. 726.

Lib. 5. cap. 7. Baron. 726. Ethelwead l. 2. cap. Huntingt. l. 4. p. 358. Malmesbur. l. 1. Marian. chron. Stovv 685. Fox. l. 2. VVestmon. An. 727. Geneb. 741. Polid. lib. 4. Stovvv in Ina.

English Seminary in Rome almost 900. years agoe.

householder of his kingdome, who had thirty peny worth of Cattel of one sort, should pay yearlie one penny to Rome: which money was partlie for the P. partlie for the maintenance of an English schoole or Seminary which he then built in Rome for bringing vp of English youths there in vertue and learning.

VVestmon. A.727.794.

Not long after about the 750. yeare S. Richard K. forsooke his kingdome, & leauing his two sonnes in Germany with S. Boniface an Englishman the Popes Legate there, went him selfe in Pilgrimage to R. but dying in the way at Luca is there honourablie buried.

S. Richard K.A.750. Sur. 7. Februar. Baron. 750.

And the yeare 775. King Offa though a warlike Prince, gaue ouer his kingdome, went to Rome, and there became a Monke: and imitating the example of King Ina, increased the English Seminary begun by him, and imposed the like pension of Peter pence vpon his kingdome of Mercia: as Charles the great about the same time imposed vpon France the like tribute

K. Offa. An. 775. Fox l.2. Martyr.

See Malmesbur. l. 2. reg. c.2.p.38. VVestmon. An.794. Bar. 775. Polid. l. 4 Hunting. l.4.p.342. Greg. 7 l.8. epist.vlt. Baron.A.782.

to be

to be paid to Rome. The loue and affection of King Kenulph, a worthie Prince, and succeſſor to King Offa, appeareth by his redeeming the Popes Legate taken of Pirats in the yeare 808. and by his ſubmiſſiue letter to the Pope, wherin he humblie craueth his bleſſing, as al his predeceſſors had, deſireth to be adopted for his ſonne, as *I* (ſaith the King) *loue you like a father, & embrace you vvith al obedience.* And proteſted to be willing to ſpend his life for the Pope.

K. Kenulph. An. 808. Annal. Fran. Baron. 808. Malmesbur. 1. Reg. c. 4. p. 30. 33.

After him King Ethelwolph in the yeare 855. went to Rome, tooke with him his beſt beloued ſonne Alfred, for to be inſtructed (ſaith weſtmonaſter) *of the Pope in manners and religion*, where he abode a whole yeare, and procured his ſonne to be crowned of the Pope and adopted of him for his ſonne, he alſo notablie repaired the Engliſh Seminary at Rome, which had bene burnt a litle before, and confirming guifts of K. Ina, and Offa, impoſed the penſion of Peter pence vpon al England,

K. Ethelvvolph. An. 855. VVeſtmon. Baron. 855. Ethelvverd lib. 3. cap. 3. Stovv Ingulphus.

Malmesb. l. 2. cap. 2. p. 38. Stovv Ann. 839.

Malmesbur. ſup. Marian. 877. Platina in Leone 4.

land, which was afterward paid vntil the later end of K: Henry 8. About the ſame time King Burdred leauing his kingdome went to Rome, and was there buried in the English ſchoole. Neither would King Canute, though a Dane be found vngrateful to the Sea Apoſt: but went to Rome in the yeare 1032. confirmed the payment of the Peter pence, gaue great guifts of golde ſiluer, and pretious things to S. Peter, & obtayned of Pope Iohn immunity for the Engliſh Seminary. And finally K. Edward Conf: the laſt but one of the Saxon bloud, would haue gone to Rome in Pilgrimage, had not his people vpon feare of the Danes inuaſion hindred him, yet ſent he Embaſſadors to the Pope with great preſents, and confirmed al the dueties & cuſtomes belonging to him in England. And thus continewed the Engliſh Kings al the time of their raigne in ſingular affection, and deuotion to the Sea Apoſtolicke.

K. Burdred. Ethelwead l. 4. c. 3. Malmesb. l. 1. c. 4. p. 33. Ingulph. Stovv 87.

K. Canute a Dane 1032. Malmesb. l. 2. cap. 1. Ingulph. Polid. l 7. Huntingt. lib 6. Stovv in Canute. Marian. A. 1033.

K. Edvvrd. Conf. An. 1056. Ealred in vit. eius.

The loue & beneſits of the Normā Kings.

To whom as the Norman Princes ſuc-

ſucceeded, ſo they followed them in their piety and religion. For beſide that they paid the Peeter pence, in particular K. william Conqueror hauing ſubdued England, and ſlaine K. Herald in the yeare 1066. ſent ſtraight his ſtandard to the Pope, as to his peculiar friend. And K. Henry 1. profeſſed by his Embaſſadour to P. Paſchal 2. that England was *a peculiar prouince of the Church of Rome, and paid vnto her yearlie tribute.* King Henry 2. about the yeare 1180. together with Lewis King of France ledde P. Alexanders horſe, and with great pompe conducted him through the Citty Tociacum. K. Richard Ceur de Lion at the exhortation of the P. went in perſon to the holy land, with an army of 30. thowſand foote, and fiue thowſand horſe: in which voiage he conquered the kingdome of Ciprus, & citty of Ptolemais, and ouerthrew the Souldan in a great battel; and the like enterpriſe afterward vndertooke K. Edward the firſt in the yeare 1241. King Henry 3.

K. VV. Conqueror. An. 1066. Stovv in Herald.

K. Henry 1. Malmesb. l. 1. Pont. p. 226.

K. Henry 2. An. 1180. Genebr. in chron. 1180.

K. Richard 1. Polid. lib. 14. Genebr. 118. Stovv.

K. Henry 3. An. 1241. Stovv An. 1241.

placed the Popes Legate in the moſt honourable roome of the table at a publique banquet in Chriſt-maſſe betwixt him ſelfe and the Archebiſhop of yorke: And afterward *vvith great pompe* (ſaith Stowe) *and innumerable company of Nobles, and trumpets ſounding before, brought him to the Sea.* How deuout K. Richard 2. and Engliſhmen in his time were to the Sea of Rome, appeareth by their building an hoſpital there, for receit of Engliſh Pilgrims (inſteed of the foreſaid Seminary which as it ſeemeth was deſtroyed in that great burning of Rome in the yeare 1084) in the place where S. Thomas of Canturbury had before built a chappel in honor of the B. Trinity. This hoſpital was afterward in the raigne of K. Henry 6. and Henry 7. reedified, and much encreaſed, and laſtlie in the yeare 1570, was much bewtifyed and augmented both in buildings and reuenews by P. Gregory 13. and by him conuerted to the auncient vſe of a Seminary, retayning ſtil the obli-

K. Richard 2. Stovv An. 1407.

the obligation of an hospital.

The affection of K. Henry 4. appeareth by his letter to the Pope A. 1409. which he beginneth thus. *Most holy father our humble recommendations in filial vvise premised.* And afterward, *hauing taken vvith our said sonne, and also vvith our Prelats and Nobles mature deliberation, vve beseech vvith al humility & require your clemency (vvhose state and honor vpon diuers causes as a deuout sonne of the Church so far as vve might vvith God, vve haue euer embraced and do embrace) by the expresse and vvholè assent of the estates aforesaid &c.* And as for King Henry 5. he in the yeare 1416. sent his Embassadors to the general Councel at Constance, at whose procurement *it vvas there ordained that England* (saith Stowe) *should obtaine the name of a nation & be said one of the fiue Nations that ovve their deuotiõ to the Church of Rome, vvhich thing vntil that time men of other Nations for enuie had letted.* Behould what an honor K. Henry 5. the Alexander of England, and Conqueror of France,

K. Henry 4. A. 1409. Stovv Ann. 1409.

K. Henry 5. An. 1416. Stovv Ann. 1416.

Note this.

and England in his moſt floriſhing & triumphant time, accounted it to owe deuotion to the Church of Rome. VVhich now Miniſters would accoũt ſo diſhonourable. And as for K. Henry 7. your Maieſties great grandfather, his affection is euident by the ſword and cup of maintenance ſent to him from the Pope, & ſpoken of before.

K. Henry 7. An. 1505.

But none of the kings of the Norman bloud euer ſhewed ſo great ſignes of loue & affection to the Sea Apoſtolike as K. Henry 8. did for a long time for firſt in the yeare 1511. he wrate to the French K. to deſiſt from moleſting Pope Iulius 2. and in the next yeare ſent an army of ten thouſand men into France for the Popes defence. And in the yeare 1513. wẽt him ſelfe in perſon with a royal army & conquered Turwin and Turnay. And not content to defend the Pope with his ſword, in the yeare 1521. wrate an excellẽt booke in his defence againſt Luther. And againe in the yeare. 1527. when Pope Clement 7. was taken priſoner by the Empe-

K. Heury 8. A. 1511. 1521. Stovv 1511. 1512. 1513. Onuphr. in Iul. 2.

Stovv An. 1521.

Emperors ſouldiers, he gaue moneth- Stowe An. 1532.
lie 60. thowſand Angels to the maintenance of an armie, for the Popes deliuery. And in this ſingular affection towards the Sea Apoſtolik continewed he vntil the 22. yeare of his raigne Stowe 1530. & deinceps.
An. 1530. when not vpon any iniury offered by the P. or diſlike of his religion, which (except the matter of ſupremacy) he defended to his death, and perſecuted the Proteſtants, but only *vpon occaſion of delaie* (ſaith Stowe) *made by the Pope in his controuerſie of deuorcement, and through diſpleaſure of ſuch reports, as he heard had bene made of him to the court of Rome, and thirdlie pricked forvvards by ſuch counſellers to followv the example of the Germanes*, he firſt forbad the procurement of any thing from Rome, and ſoone after prohibited al payments and appeales to Rome, and laſtlie tooke vpon him that ſupremacy which al his Chriſtian predeceſſors had acknowledged to be in the Pope.

Thus your Maieſtie ſeeth how long,

how

how honourablie, and how profitablie alſo vnto both parties, hath the mutual amity and league of friendship, betwixt the Sea Apoſt. and the Princes of al the foure Nations, that haue ſwaied the Scepter of England continewed and flourished: & how of late it was broken by one Prince vpon meere paſſion, contrary to the example of al his Predeceſſors and Succeſſors alſo, except one childe and a woeman. VVhat dangers and troubles he and his kingdome incurred thereby, and how his progeny (according as Frier Pœto did then foretel him) is now conſumed, and his Crowne tranſlated to an other Royal lyne, againſt which in his time he made sharpe war, I need not heere declare. Only I wil ſay, that him ſelfe being after more free from paſſion, laboured to be reconciled to the Sea Apoſtolike and employed therein B. Gardener (as he profeſſed in a ſermon at Paules Croſſe) and had eaſelie obtained it, if he would haue acknowledged his

fault

fault and done penance. VVhat remaineth for me to conclude this long epiſtle, but proſtrate at your Maieſties feet humblie to beſeech you for your owne good, and in the name of the foreſaid Chriſtian Princes, that as you are the head of the fieft Nation, which (according to Gods prouidence foretolde by a holy man many hundred years agoe) hath attained to the rule of this land, ſo you would continew that moſt auncient, honourable, and proffitable league of friendship, which was betwixt them al and the Sea Apoſtolicke; who (I beſeech your grace) wil giue you more faithful councel, then your owne Progenitors and forefathers? who can giue you more ſafe and ſecure directiō in gouernement of your kingdome, then your owne Predeceſſors, who ſoe happily, and ſo long time gouerned it? who are ſo worthie to giue you example, or whom can you with ſo much honor imitate, as ſo many, ſo valiant, ſo prudent Princes?

Hunting. l. 6. p. 89.

ces? and yet they al with one voice, counsel and requeſt you, to follow in this ſo importāt a matter, not ſo much them ſelues, as the councel of the wiſeſt King that euer was, yea of God himſelfe in theſe words. *Thine owne friend and thy fathers friend ſee thou forſake not*, eſpeciallie ſuch a one, as hath euer bene not only your owne friend, and particularly your B. mothers friend, but of al your Chriſtian forefathers. VVho as they haue lefte vnto your grace their Crowne and kingdome; ſo haue they alſo bequeathed their faith religion & friendſhip with the Sea Apoſtolick, as no ſmal portion and ſtay of their inheritance. VVe eſtieme your publique acknowledging of Rome to be the Mother Church, and your ſelfe to be behoulding to P. Clement 8. *for his temporal cariadge and kinde offices*, as ſparks of a greater fyer of loue inkindled in your Princely hart towards that Sea, which we beſeech almighty God ſo to increaſe, as it may one day burſt forth to your owne

Prouerb. 27.

owne good, and the vniuerſal ioy of Chriſtendome. Our Lord Ieſus long preſerue your Maieſtie with al grace, health, and proſperity

Your Maieſties ductiful Subiect and daily Oratour.

S. R.

THE EPISTLE TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

AS no water (Christian Reader) waxeth so could, as that which hath bene once hot: no enemies become so cruel to a common wealth, as Rebels who haue bene once subiect: So none are so eager aduersaries to Gods Church as Apostataes, who heue once bene her members, and children. Amongst Heretikes none more earnest against the Apostles then the first Apostata Simon Magus, who dared to encounter hand to hand with the principal Apostle S. Peter, and labored to seduce by his magik, whom he by myracles had conuerted. Amongst the Tyrants, and persecutors none more cruel then Iulian the Apostata, who by blood endeuored to wash away his Christendom, and both by sword, & pen laboured al he could, not only to extinguish the religion, but also the very name, and memory of Christians. Amongst Philosophers none more vehement then Porphyry the Apostata, who writ fifteen books against Christian religion, and for his

S. Maximus serm. de Apost.

S. Hieron. de Scriptor. in Petro.

Baron. Annal. An. 68.

Nazianz. orat. 1. in Iulian.

Theodoret. lib. 3. c. 21.

Porphirius & Iulian. rabidi in Christum canes. Hieron.

his singuler hatred therof was syrnamed *tou Christianon polemios* the Christians aduersary. And in these our miserable daies none haue bene so spiteful, so malicious, so vehement against Catholiques ether in persecuting, speaking, or writing, as they who haue bene once Catholiques. And in England now none sheweth him selfe, so forward, or so vehement against Catholiques as the Apostata Bel, daring, challenging and adiuring al Papists iointly, and seuerally to the combat with him, being desirous as it seemeth of the tytle of *ton catholicon polemios*. The Catholiques aduersary.

These Apostataes be like to him, who being deliuered of one diuel, the house clensed with beesoms and trimmed vp, was afterward possessed with seauen diuels worse then the former, and his end made worse then his beginning. For such is the estate of this miserable caitiue Bel, who being once deliuered from the diuel of Heresy, clensed with the beesom of confession, and Penance, and trimmed with patient sufferance for the Catholique faith, falling afterward to idlenes, and dissolute life, wherof him self since hath boasted, is possessed again of his old diuel of Heresy accompained with seuen other wicked sprits of blasphemy, railing; pride, slaundering,

Luc. 11. v. 25. 26.

See S. Irenæ lib. 1. c. 13.

dering, lying, diſſembling, and abuſing of Gods and holy Fathers words, and his end becomme far worſe then his beginning was. His ſpirit of blaſphemy he deſcryeth in many places as p.149. where he ſaith that *God hath giuen vs thoſe commandements which we can not poſſibly keep.* This the holy Father S. Hierom both calleth, and accurſeth as blaſphemy in theſe words. *VVe curſe their blaſphemy who ſay that God hath commanded to man any impoſſible thing.* And no maruel. For what reaſon can ther be in God to command a thing which he knoweth can not be done? what fault in vs not to do that which can not be done? what iuſtice in him to punish, and that with eternal death, the not performance of that which can not be performed? If neuer there was man ſo void of reaſon as would commād a thing, which he knew could not be done, neuer Tyrant ſo cruel as wold puniſh with temporal death the vnperformance of impoſſible matters, shal we think it no blaſphemy to God, to attribute that to him which we can not imagin that any man who hath any ſpark of reaſon, or humanity wold attempt? Hauing thus blaſphemed againſt God no meruail if he blaſpheme againſt his Church of late daies ſaying. p. 134. that she is no ſufficient witnes of his truth, & p. 41. againſt

S. Hieron. epiſt. ad Damaſc. de expoſi. ione fidei.

Quod rationem non habet dici non debuit. S. Eugenius apud Victorem de perſecut. vandal. l. 2.

XUM

againſt our iuſtification calling it *ſuppoſed holy* wherby he giueth vs to vnderſtand that as he is fallen from God and his Church, and loſt holy iuſtification, ſo he is an enemy to them al.

His railing ſpirit he could ſo il maiſter, as in the very firſt period of his epiſtle to the King, without reſpect of his Maieſtie he muſt needs cal vs *the curſed brood of traiterous Ieſuits*, and ſtreight after ſpeaking *ex abundantia cordis*, and reuiling eſpecially againſt the Ieſuits, who haue bene his maiſters, he auoucheth them to be *traiterous, ſeditious, brutish, barbarous, cruel, villanous, moſt bloody, treacherous, prowd, cruel, tyrants, firebrands of al ſedition, theeues, murderers, right Machiuels, cooſiners, malicious, and dependers vpon the diuel.* And of this Rhetorik I expect good ſtore for my part, but the more the merrier, ſuch reprochful terms in this quarrel shal be to me *ſuper millia auri, & argenti*. His pride is more notorious then I need shew it. For if it were pride in Golias though a Gyant to challenge any of Gods hoſte, what is it in this puny, not only to challenge, but to adiure al Papiſts ſeuerally and iointly, being him ſelfe not worthy to cary the books after many of them, as shal appeare by his manifold ignorance, not only in deuinity, but alſo euen in Latin, principles of Logik, *Epiſtle to the King.* *See the Index.*

Hiſtories, and Preaching, as shal be made manifeſt in this anſwer.

pag: 17. His ſlaũders reach euen from the higheſt to the loweſt, Kings and Emperours he ſlaundereth with no les matter then opening the window to al Antichriſtian tyranny. Popes (who long tyme manteined him at ſchool) with challẽging powre equal to God, with diſpenſing with one to marry his ful ſiſter, with burning the Scriprure, and the like. And Papiſts he ſlaundereth with killing Chriſt a thouſand tymes a day, with affirming that the Pope can depoſe Kings and Emperors, and tranſlate their Empires and regalities at his good wil and pleaſure, with attributing to the Pope powre equal to God, thinking the breach of Lent to be a greater ſin then adultery periury, or murder. His other three ſpirits, of lying, diſſembling, and abuſing Gods word euery where shew them ſelues in his books, and now and then are noted in my anſwer.

Bels ingratitude.

p. 16. 40. 106.

p. 22.

p. 1.

p. 16.

p. 130.

No maruel therfore if one poſſeſſed of ſo many, and ſo wicked ſpirits be ſo forwatd, ſo ſpiteful, ſo malicious, againſt Catholiques, as to callenge, & adiure them al iointly or ſeuerally to the combat with him. Oh that it would pleaſe his Maieſtie to admit this combat, that Bel, & I (the weakeſt of many

of many thouſands of Gods ſoldiers) might try the truth, not by writing, which bluſheth not (as Tully ſaid) but face to face as the Biſhop of Eureux, and Pleſſy did before the French King. I doubt not but if there were any blood in Bels body, or any ſhame of men in his minde, I ſhold make it appeare in his face. But whiles this combat muſt be fought a far of, only by paper ſhot, and writing and our writings kept from the view of the people, no meruail if Bel feare no ſhame of men, whiles they may ſee him fight, & florish, but muſt not behold ether defence or blowes of his aduerſary.

If he be ſo confidēt in his Hereſy (which he once vomited forth, and now like the dog hath lickt vp again) as he maketh shew of, why hath he not in al this tyme of his Apoſtaſy procured lycence for publike diſputation? or at leſt, why neuer repaired he to the Catholique Prieſts in priſon? Let him procure but one ſuch ſafe conducte for Prieſts as the councel of Trent graunted three or fowre to Proteſtants (when none of our English Miniſters durſt accept it) & he shal not need to challenge, or adiure, but shal be dared at his owne dore. For Prieſts who willingly ſpend their blood in teſtimony of the truth which they teach, wil far ſooner ſpend their breath in defence Seſſ. 13. 17. 18.

Epistle to the King.

therof, & are ready (to make the like offer as Bel doth in a different matter) to iustify it before indifferent iudges against him, or what Protestant soeuer vpon peril of their liues, if their aduersaries wil aduenture the like peril. And vpon this condition Bel I challenge thee, and adiure thee, accept it if thou dares. What more could haue bene done to bring this so weighty a matter, wherupon dependeth the eternal saluation of so many millions of soules to tryal face to face, then hath bene done of Catholiques by speaking, by writing, by petition, by supplication? Puritans vpon one only supplication haue bene admitted to Conference, Catholiques can vpon none. And this is that which maketh Bel so bold to challeng vs to the open combat, when he knoweth we can not appeare in open shew, but vpon hazard of our liues. And I wold to God that with danger, yea with losse of life we might be lycēced publikly to try this truth so important to the eternal life of our deares countrimen. But seeing there is no hope of this, when I red Bels challenge it seemed to me not only an vnlearned thing, patcht vp of obiections gathered out of Bellarmin, and learnedly answered by him, but a witles challenge of some coward, who seeing his enemy commanded vpon pain of death

death to keep his houſe, callengeth him to the open field, and more like to condemne the Author of folly, and vanity; then the Catholique religion of falſity before any diſcreet, & iudicious Reader. Neuertheles becauſe (as I vnderſtood ſome monthes after the publishing of it) ſome vnaduiſed Proteſtants hearing Bels glorious vaunts and challeng, had conceaued great hope of this their Champion, & thought his booke vnāſwerable, I took it in hand not knowing as then that any other wold vouchſafe to medle with it, & haue left to my knowledg no one point therin vnanſwered, attending more to ſolue what he obiecteth, then to cōfirme what Catholikes mantein, though this alſo I haue done ſufficiently (as I hope) for my intended breuity.

Author of the Forerunner of Bels downefal.

He termeth this challeng a downfal of Popery and yet in the greateſt part therof impugneth no point of Popery, but ether perticuler opinions of priuat men, or (which is worſe) falſe imputations of his owne, being ſo deſirous of quarrelling, as he fighteth with his owne ſhadow. And what he impugneth he doth with ſo good ſucceſſe, as almoſt in euery Article he ouerthroweth what he meant to eſtabliſh, and confirme. So that if he had giuen his booke the right name he ſhold haue called it the downfal of

What Bel impugneth.

With what ſucceſſe.

Bels foolery. Of theſe eight Articles which he hath pickt out as moſt aduantagious for him ſelf, & in which there are ſome things, which as S. Auſtin ſpeaketh l. de vtil. cred. c. 1. to. 6. *may be impugned to the common peoples capacity, but not be defended by reaſon of their difficulty but of few*. In the firſt he impugneth the Popes ſuperiority ouer al Princes on earth, and his powre to depoſe them at his good wil, and pleaſure. wherof the firſt is but the opinion of ſome few Canoniſts cõmonly reiected of al Catholiks, and diſproued at large by Bellarmin, whoſe doctrine Bel accounteth the Popes owne doctrin, & ſaith it is approued by him. The ſecond no Catholik holdeth, but it is Bels faulſe ſlaunder of Catholiks. In the ſecond omitting the queſtion of the being of Chriſts body in the bleſſed ſacrament, he impugneth the being of his quantity therein as a thinge (ſaith he) held of al papiſts as an article of their faith, which is vntrue, as is declared in the anſwer. In the third he inueigheth againſt the Popes powre to diſpenſe in matrimony before it be conſummated, which likwiſe is an opinion of Canoniſts, & commonly refuted of Catholik deuines. In the fift omittinge true merit which is a point of faith, he impugneth condigne merit as a thinge defined by the Councel of Trent

S. Auſtin.

pag: 1.

p: 19.

pag. 37.

p: 75.

which

which it is not. In the seuenth Article in steede of Traditions conteining things necessary for mans saluation, which in the beginning of the article he proposed to impugne, he impugneth an erronious opinion of Papias about Christs reigne after his iudgement, and an other of S. Ireney about Christs age, one history about Zachary S. Ihon Baptists father, & an other concerning Constãtins baptisme, a probable opinion of Popes priuate teaching the same doctrin with S Peter, and an other concerning our Ladies Cõception without sin. In the eight he oppugneth the keeping of Gods commandments in such a sense as no Catholik dreameth of. So that though he had slong down al these matters, yet ther had bene no downfal of Popery. Is not this fellow think you a iolly challenger of Papists? a goodly downfeller of Popery? Is not he one of thos of whom S. Paul saith willinge to be Doctors of the law, know nether what they say, nor of what. p. 131. 132. 133. 1. Timoth. 1

But if we marke the successe which this Champion hath, whiles he yet flourisheth by him self, before his aduersary enter the field, and like Vergils Bul.

---- beates the winde withal his might
And casting sand doth florish to the fight. A Eneid. 11.

it is admirable. For, omitting particuler cõ-

traditions, almost in euery Article he flingeth down the very main point which he wold establish. As art. 1. he wold proue that the Pope hath no superiority ouer Princes, nor power to depose them: and yet affirmeth that *some Kings, and Emperors haue humbled them selues, yeelded their soueraign rights to him, and that Popes lined in dutiful obedience vnder Emperors vntil the year* 603. which he proueth by S. Gregory, and yet no les then six Popes did in that tyme excommunicate their Emperors, & S. Gregory was the first that decreed the deposition of Kings and Princes. In the second article after he had talked long against the real presence and sacrifice of the Masse he falleth to cal the *sacrificing of* (Christs) *flesh with Preists hands*, golden words, and to say that *if we wold be iudged by a doctrin of Bellarmins*, (which a litle before he had said was the Popes doctrin) *the controuersy about the real presence wold be at an end*. In the fourth article after he had long labored to proue inuoluntary motions of the flesh to be formal sin, and called the contrary damnable doctrin, he both affirmeth and proueth such inuoluntary motiõs in S. Paul to haue bene no sin, becaus they were against his wil. In the fift Article after he had spent many leaues to fling down condigne merit, at the last he auoucheth, that

pag. 17.
pag 2.
S. Fabian.
S. Innocent. 1.
Symmachus
S. Felix 2.
Anastasius 2.
Vigilius.
p. 26. 27.
pag. 48.

that if we wold be iudged by Bellarmins & others doctrin published in print, that controuersy wold be ended, & yet immediatly before he had affirmed that Bellarm. taught his doctrin of merit, (which is the very some which commonly al Catholiks hold) *after mature deliberation, and graue consultation with al the best learned Iesuits in the World, and with the Pope himself.* What is this but to confesse that in vain he impugneth the Popes doctrin of merit? Such is the force of truth (saith S. Austin) *that it is more forceable to wring out confession, then any rack or torment.* In the sixt Article he admitteth the distinction of mortal and venial sin in a godly sense (as he saith) and yet streight after concludeth absolutly that al sins are mortal, and saith that we flatter our selfs in our cursed deformed venials. In the seuenth article after he had spent 27. leaues to fel down Traditions, called them falshoods, and vanities p. 93. and pronounced them accursed of S. Paul who receaue them: at last him self p. 134. and 135. accepteth one Tradition about the Bible whither it be Gods word or no; wherby he beateth down whatsoeuer before he had set vp against the Traditions of the Church. In the last he graunteth that Gods commandements are possible to be kept in a godly sense, and yet afterward absolutly

p. 78. 79.

Lib. cont. Donat. post collat. c. 24. *pag.* 81.

p. 134. 135.

solutly concludeth that we can not possibly keep them. Thus we see this silly fellow as he hath bene of opposit religions and professions, so playing ambedexter, now the minister now the Priest, now the Protestant now the Catholik. What aduersary need such a challenger who is so great an aduersary to him self? what successe is he like to haue of a mean aduersary, who hath this euil euent of his own brauado?

p. 149.

pag. 31. *Preface to Iesuits Seminary Priests.*

He promiseth to subscribe if one argument which he maketh vpon S. Austins words be answered, or if any could conuince him ether to haue alleadged any writer corruptly or to haue quoted any place guilfully, or to baue charged any other falsly. But al this is fraudulently done only to gain credit with the simple, and ignorant Reader of a sincere and inuincible challenger. For himself wel knoweth how often that argument out of S. Austin hath bene solued by Catholiks, against which solution becaus Bel cold not reply he wold quite dissemble it. And his allegations of Authors is too too shamful as shal appeare in the processe of this answer. Scripture he alleadgeth but as the Diuel did, when he brought it against our Sauiour, corrupting ether the words, or meaning. Fathers he bringeth but quite against their wil, and mea-

See S. Hilary lib. ad Constant. S. Hierom cont. Lucifer. vincent. lyrin. cont. hereses.

meaning and no maruel for he forbeareth not his profeſſed aduerſaries ſuch as in our daies haue written againſt Proteſtants, and wil make them wil they nil they turne Proteſtants, as he hath done, & like the ſpider ſuck poiſon out of ſweet flowers. And I doubt nothing more, then that if he find this anſwere to ſtrong for him to impugne, he wil ether proclaime me a Proteſtant as his breethren do Bellarmin, or procure him ſelf (as his Father Iewel did) to be quit by proclamation, againſt my book. But Bel, if thou didſt meane ſincerely to repent if thou beeſt conuinced, *remember whence thou art fallen and do penance*: or if thou intendeſt obſtinatly to fight it out, harken to S. Hierome, and *take ſome ſhame becoming a man, if thou wilt haue none belonging to a Chriſtian*, and deale plainly, ſet downe the Catholike doctrin truly, alleadg Authors incorruptly, cite the places rightly, anſwer directly yea or no to euery thing obiected, and then in Gods name *Verte omnes tete in facies & contra-he quicquid, ſiue animo ſiue arte Vales*: and I dare warrant thee, it shal be anſwered.

Daue of Recuſancy. pag. 22.

Apoc. 13.

Hieron. apolog. cont. Ruffinum.

Æneid. 12.

But thee (my dear Countryman) ſeduced by Bel & ſuch like, who *walking in craftines adulterate Gods worde*, for whoſe ſake al this pain is taken, I beſeech for Chriſts ſake, haue ſome care of thy ſaluation, conſider how

2. Cor. 4. v. 2.

how of late your Church ſeruice and diſci-
pline hath bene condemned by more then
a thowſand miniſters of *enormities, & abuſes*
not agreable to Scripture, and want of vniformity of doctrin, al your English Bibles (the
very foundation of your faith) adiudged *to*
be il tranſlated, and ſome to contein *very par-*
tial, vntrue and ſeditious notes, and too much ſa-
uoring of dangerous, and traiterous conceits, and
order taken to make a new tranſlation. Alas
what certainty can you haue of that reli-
gion, which more then a thowſand of your
Miniſters profeſſe to haue no vniformity
of doctrin, and abuſes contrary to Scrip-
ture? what goodnes can there be in that
faith, which is builded of an euil founda-
tion, as by your owne iudgmēts your Bibles
hitherto haue bene? yea what faith at al can
there be in this mean tyme, whiles the old
Bibles are condemned as naught, and a new
not yet made? If theſe Miniſters had once
deceaued you in a mony matter, you wold
beware how you truſted them again, and
wil you beleeue them ſtil, they hauing by
their owne confeſſion, hitherto deceaued
you both in your Church ſeruice, & Bible,
commending the one to you as diuine ſer-
uice, and the other as Gods pure word, and
now condemning them both. Open your
eyes for the paſſion of Chriſt, and ſeeing
publike

Petition exhibited in April. 1603.

See Conference at Hampton Court. pag. 45. 46. 47.

publike conference wil not be graunted, where we might lay open vnto you the deceits of your Miniſters, help your ſelfs as wel as you may, read with indifferency ſuch books as are written for this purpoſe, make earneſt interceſſion to God to ſee the truth, & grace to follow it when you haue found it, which God of his goodnes graunt. Farewel. 2. Februar: 1605.

Thy ſeruant in Chriſte
IESV.

S. R.

A TABLE OF THE ARTI-
CLES AND CHAPTERS.

ARTICLE I.
Of the Popes Superiority.

BELS argument against the Popes superiority answered, diuers his vntruths and dissimulations therin discouered. Chapt. 1.

The opinion of Protestants touching Princes supremacy set down. Chapt. 2.

The opinion of Protestants touching deposition of Princes. Chapt. 3.

The practise of Protestants touching deposition of Princes. Chapt. 4.

Bels proofes of his assumption against the Popes superiority answered: Chapt. 5.

Bels answer to an argument of Catholiks for the Popes superiority confuted: Chap. 6.

Some of Bels slaunderous vntruths disproued: Chapt. 7.

Certain fals steps of a ladder which Bel imagineth the Pope had to clime to his superiority disproued: Chapt. 8.

The rest of Bels fals steps, and slaunderous vntruths in this article disproued: Chap. 9.

ARTICLE 2.
Of the Masse.

Bels reason against the real presence of Christ in the B. Sacrament answered, his vntruth and dissimulation therin discouered: Chapt. 1.

Authorities alleadged by Bel against the real presence answered: Chapt. 2.

Masse proued, Bels argumēt against it answered, & his manifold vntruths therin disproued: Chap. 3.

The rest of Bels arguments against the Masse confuted: Chap. 4.

Berengarius his recantation explicated and S. Austins authority answered: Chap. 5.

Bels

Bels imaginary contradictions in the Masse answered, and true contradictions in his communion shewed: Chap. 6.

ARTICLE III.

Of the Popes Dispensations: Chapt. 1.

ARTICLE IIII.

Of original concupiscence in the regenerate.

The Catholike doctrin touching concupiscence explicated and proued: Chap. 1.

Diuers vntruths of Bel disproued, his arguments out of S. Paul against the doctrin of the former Chapter answered: Chap. 2.

Bels arguments out of S. Austin touching concupiscence answered: Chap. 3.

Bels arguments out of S. Ambros, S. Bede, & S. Thomas touching concupiscence answered: Chap. 4.

ARTICLE V.

Of the merit of good works.

Of the Protestanis enmity to good works, and frendship with euil: Chap. 1.

Of Bels positions touching good works: Chap. 2.

The Catholiks doctrin touching merit particulerly set downe and proued: Chapt. 3.

Bels arguments out of Scripture against condigne merit answered: Chap. 4.

Bels arguments out of holy Fathers against condigne merit answered: Chap. 5.

Bels arguments out of late Catholik writers against condigne merit answered: Chap. 6.

ARTICLE VI.

Of the distinction of mortal and venial sins.

The true distinction proued, and Bels obiection answered: Chapt. 1.

A text of S. Ihon epist. 1. explicated: Chap. 2.

ARTICLE VII.

The Catholike doctrin touching sufficiency of Scripture propounded, & proued certaine vntruths of Bel

of Bel disproued: Chap. 1.
Bels arguments out of the old testamẽt, concerning the sufficiency of Scripture answered: Chap. 2.
Bels arguments out of the new testament, touching sufficiency of Scripture answered: Chap. 3.
Bels arguments out of Fathers, touching sufficiency of Scripturs, and Traditions answered. Chap. 4.
Bels arguments out of late Catholik writers, touching sufficiency of Traditions and Scripture answered: Chap. 5.
Of the difficulty or easynes of Scripture: Chap. 6.
Of the vulgar peoples reading Scripture: Chap. 7.
Of the translation of Scripture into vulgar tongs: Chap. 8.
Of Apostolical Traditions whether ther be any or none: Chap. 9.
Of the certainty of Apostolical Traditiõs: Chap. 10.
Of the examination of Traditions: Chap. 11.
Bels arguments out of Fathers about the examination of Traditions answered: Chap. 12.
Of the authority of late general Coũcels: Chap. 13.
Of the oath which Bishops vse to make vnto the Pope: Chapt. 14.

ARTICLE VIII.

Of keeping Gods commandements.

The possibility of keeping Gods commandements explicated and proued out of Scripture: Chap. 1.
The possibility of keeping Gods commandements proued out of Fathers and reason: Chap. 2.
Bels arguments out of Scripture against the possibility of keeping Gods commandements answered: Chapt. 3.
Bels arguments out of Fathers against the possibility of keeping Gods commandements answered: Chapt. 4.

THE

THE FIRST ARTICLE

OF THE POPES SVPERIORITY.

CHAPT. I.

Bels arguments againſt the Popes Superiority anſwered, diuers his vntruthes and diſſimulations therin diſcouered.

BEL like a man in great choler and very deſirous to encounter with his enemie beginneth his chalenge very abruptly & haſtily, yet not forgetting his ſcholerſchip or miniſterie he geueth the onſet with a ſyllogiſme ful charged with vntruthes & diſſimulacions. *You Papiſtes* (ſaith he) *tel vs that the Pope is aboue al powers and potentates on earth, that he can depoſe Kinges & Emperours from their royal thrones and tranſlate their empires and regalities at his good wil and pleaſure: But this doctrin is falſe, abſurde, & nothing elſe but a mere fable: And conſequently Romish Religion conſiſteth of meere falſehoods, fables & flat leaſinges.* 3. vntruthes. 2. diſſimulations.

2. Not without cauſe (gentle Reader)

hath Bel proposed these bloudy questions of the Popes supremacie and deposition of Princes in his first article, and placed them in the forefront of his battel, for he hopeth that they wil be his best bulwarke and surest defense in the combate, & that in such lystes he shal not fight alone, but assisted with the Princes sworde, wherein he dealeth with Catholiques *as Puritanes* (which his Maiesty prudently obserueth) *doe with protestants, who because they could not otherwise make their partes good against protestants, appeale to his supremacie.* And as the old Arians did, who euermore accused the Catholiques as iniurious to the Prince, which they al learne of the Iewes, who being vnable to disprooue Christs doctrine endeuoured to bring him into the compasse of treason, and at last procured his death as enemy to Cesar. Wherfore ymitating the example of our Sauiour, when the like question was propounded to seeke his bloud, I answere Bel briefelie. That what is Cesars, we ought to geue to Cesar, and what is Gods, to God, and what is Gods Vicars, to Gods Vicar. Onely because Bel in his said syllogisme chargeth Catholiques most fassely, & withal dissembleth the opinion of protestantes touching the supremacie and deposition of Princes. I wil disproue his vntruthes, and discouer

Conference at Hampton Court. pag. 82. 83.

Ambr. epist. 32. victor lib. 1. de presser. vandol.

Matth. 22. v. 17.

Luc. 20. v. 25.

discouer his dissimulations; and afterward compare the opinion and practise of Protestants & Catholiques touching this matter together: whereby the indifferent Reader may, by Bels euil and corrupt dealing in the very beginning of his chalenge take a taste of the rest of his proceedings. for, as Tertullian saith well, *What truth doe they defend who begin it with lyes?* Tertull. l. de præscripe.

3. I demand therfore of Bel who they are whome he chalengeth, to whome he speaketh, and whome he vnderstandeth by, *You Papists*; Surely I suppose he writeth in English to none but such as vnderstand English, whome in his preface he termeth English Iesuyts, Seminary Priests, & Iesuyted Papists. Yf these (Maister Bel) be they whome ye meane, I tel you in their name, that as your propositiō hath two parts, viz. the Popes Superiority ouer al Princes and of his power to depose them, so it conteineth three (to vse your owne tearme) flatte leasinges.

For though, concerning Christians, they beleeue the Pope to be spiritually superiour aboue al whatsoeuer accordinge to Christs words spoken to the first Pope S. Peter, Matth. 16. viz. *Thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke will I buylde my Church*, and Io. 21. v. 17. *Feede my sheepe*, which sheepe conteine and

include as wel Christian Princes and potentates as subiects and vnderlings. And, concerning infidels, they also beleeue that the Pope ought to be spiritually aboue them, and they vnder him in that they be bound to be Christians: neuertheleſſe, vntil theſe be Christened, he is not actually their ſuperiour: vntil they be made members of Christs Church, he is not *de facto* their head: vntil they be in Christs fould, he is not their sheape hearde. For, as Bellarmin writeth; whoſe teſtimonie (ſaith Bel) is moſt ſufficient in al Popiſshe affaires, *Christ was aboue as wel infidels as faithful, But to S. Peter he committed onely his sheepe, that is the faithful.* Wherefore S. Paul as not acknowledging that he had any ſuperiority or iuriſdiction ouer infidels ſaid, *What belongeth it to me to iudge of them that are without?* 1. Cor. 5. And although the Pope may preach him ſelfe or ſend others to preache to infidels without their licence, yet this argueth no more but that the commiſſion which he hath from God to preach the Ghoſpel vnto al nations is independent of the infidels, and that they ought to be vnder his iuriſdictiō. Wherefore vntil Bel doe prooue that there are no powers or potērates on earth which are infidels, I muſt needs tel him that he vntruly auoucheth vs to ſay that the Pope is ſpi-

Bellarm. lib. 5. de Rom. Pont. c. 7.

Bel p. 29. 115.

is ſpiritually aboue al powers and potentates on earth.

4. And much leſſe did we euer tel you that the Pope hath temporal ſuperiority ouer al Princes on earth, but teach the quite contrary with, *VValden*, *Bellarmin*, and others. For as two moſt auncient Popes, *Gelaſius* 1. and *Nicolaus* 1. taught vs, the Pope by his Pontifical dignity chalengeth neither *royal ſoueraignity*. *nor imperial name*. But what royalties he hath either in the Popedome or els where, he chalengeth by the guift of Chriſtian Princes whereof. *Some* (as your ſelfe confeſſe) *haue yeelded vp their ſoueraigne rights*, *vnto him*. And what ſuperiority we thinke him to haue ouer Chriſtian Princes, he ſhould haue though he were not Lord of one foote of land, but as poore, as he that ſaid Math. 19. v. 27 *Behould we haue forſaken al*. For his Papal ſuperiority and authority is not temporal or of this wotld, nor the weapones of his warfare carnal, but (as S. Paul ſpeaketh) mighty to God, vnto the diſtruction of munitious deſtroying Counſels, and al loftines extolling it ſelfe againſt the knowledge of God, and hauing in readines to reuenge al diſobedience. Wherupon P. Innocent. 3. profeſſeth that the Pope hath ful power in temporal matters, only in the

VValden. tom.1. lib.2. art.3.c.78. Bellarm.lib. 5. de Rom. Pont. c.4. Gelaſ. 1. de vincul. Anathematis. Nicol. 1. di 96.Can.cum ad verum.

Pag. 17.

S. Mathew

S. Paul. 2. *Cor.* 10.

Cap.per venerab. extra qui filij ſunt legitimi.

Popedome, and that *Kings acknowledge no superior in temporal affaires.* And this also teach S. Ambros de Apol. Dauid c. 4. & 10 Gloss. Lyra in psalm. 50. and others. By which it appeareth how much he is abused who is made to beleue, *That the Pope present, challengeth an imperial ciuil power ouer Kings, & Emperors, or that English Papists do attribute vnto him any such power.* For neither doth Paulus 5. challeng more authority, then Innocent 3. did, nor English Papists attribute vnto him other authority ouer Kings then spiritual. But do with tong, and hart, and with the Popes good liking professe: *That our Soueraigne Lord King Iames hath no superior on earth in temporal matters.* If Bel reply that some Canonists haue affirmed the Pope to be temporal Lord ouer the world, let him challeng them & not like a wise man strike his next fellows the English Papists, who mantayne no such opinion.

S. Ambros. tom. 4.

5. The second parte of his Proposition touching the Popes deposition of Princes at his pleasure, though he repeat it thrise is most vntrue. For no Catholiques, English or strangers, teach that the Pope can depose Princes but for iust causes, yea *ordinarily* (saith Bellarmin) *not for iust causes, but when it is necessary for the sauing of souls.* And surely otherwise Princes shold be but his tenants at wil,

pag. 1. 4. 17.

Bellarm. lib. 5. de Rom. Pontif. c. 6.

at wil, and he haue more power ouer them, then they haue ouer their ſubiects. which is far from al Catholiques imaginations, let vs ſee therfore how Bel proueth vs to teach this doctrin. Bel p. 2.

6. *Becauſe* (ſaith he) *Bellarmin ſetteth it downe in theſe words, If therfore any Prince, of a sheep or a ram become a Wolfe, that is to ſay, of a Chriſtian be made an heretike, then the Paſtor of the Church may driue him away by excommunication, and withal command the people not to obey him, and therfore depriue him of his dominion ouer his ſubiects.* Behold (good Reader) the forſaid vntruthes proued with an other. Becauſe Bellarmin calleth the Pope Paſtor of the Church, Bel auoucheth him to think the Pope to be aboue al Princes, & Potentates on earth; as if there were no Princes infidels, or out of the Church: and becauſe he teacheth that the Pope may excommunicate, and depoſe Princes for Hereſy, that he may depoſe them at his pleaſure, as if matters of Hereſy (which is one of the greateſt ſinns that is) were the Popes pleaſure. An indifferent reader would rather haue inferred, that becauſe the Pope is Paſtor of the Church, he is not aboue any infidel, Prince, or ſubiect; which Bellarmin teacheth in expreſſe words in the ſame booke c. 2. & 4. And becauſe he can not excõmunicate, Bellarm. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 5. c. 7. 4. vntruth. Bellarmin.

ſo neither depoſe Princes for his pleaſure, which Bellarmin euery where ſuppoſeth, yea in the ſame book c. 6. auoucheth. That *ordinarily he can not depoſe Princes euen for iuſt cauſes.*

Anatomy of Popish tyrany in the Caueat to the Reader and lib. 2. cap. 4 §. 10. & c. 9.

7. But let vs heare Bel diſproue him ſelf; *Secular Prieſts* (ſaith he) *write plainly and reſolutly that the Pope hath no power to depriue Kings of their royal Scepters, and regalities, nor to giue away their Kingdomes to an other. In which opinio̅ like wiſe the French Papiſts do concurre, & iump with them.* Item. *The Seculars, although they ackno wledge the Popes power ſupereminent in Spiritualibus yet do they diſclaime from it in temporalibus when he taketh vpon him to depoſe Kinges from their empires and tranſlate their Kingdomes.* And leaſt we ſhould thinke theſe few Prieſts, who wrote ſo, were no Papiſts, Bel him ſelf teſtifieth that they are *the Popes deare Vaſſals and profeſſe the ſelfe ſame religion with other Catholiques.*

1. Contradiction.

Epiſtle to the King.

8. The third vntruth conteined in the propoſition is that we teach the doctrine of his propoſition as a pointe of our faith: wherevpon he inferreth in his concluſion, our religion and faith to be falſe. Becauſe we teach no ſuch doctrine at al and much leſſe as a point of our religion or faith. And the graueſt & beſt learned amongſt Catholiques attribute to the Pope onely ſpiritual ſupe-

ſuperiority ouer Princes, and power to depoſe them in that caſe wherin our Sauiour ſaid Math. 18. that it were better for a man to be caſt into the ſea then to liue, to wit, when they ſo ſcandalize others as their depoſition is neceſſary for the ſaluation of ſoules as I haue already shewed out af Bellarmin, whoſe teſtimony in this matter Bel can not refuſe ſeing he calleth him the mouth of Papiſts and auoucheth his doctrin to be the Popes owne doctrin. And this doctrin good Chriſtiã Princes account no more preiudicial or iniurious to their eſtates, then they do the like doctrin of S. Paul 2. Cor. 10. where he profeſſeth him ſelf to haue power to deſtroy al loftines extolling it ſelf againſt the knowledge of God, & to be ready to punish al diſobedience. Bel. parag. 29.

9. Wherfore, to requite Bel with a ſyllogiſme like vnto his owne, I argue thus: you Bel tel vs that we Papiſts ſaie, the Pope is aboue al powers and potentates on earth, that he can depoſe Kings and Emperours, and tranſlate their empiers at his good wil and pleaſure, But this your tale is a very tale falſe, abſurd, and nothing elſe but a mere fable: and conſequently your late chalenge conſiſteth of mere falſehoods fables & flat leaſings. The propoſition is your owne wordes, the truth of the aſſumption appeereth

reth by my answer to your argument. And thus much touching Bels vntruthes vttered in his proposition and proofe therof, now let vs come to his dissemblinge.

Chap. II.

The opinion of protestants touching Princes Supremacie, set dovvne.

Luthes. lib. cont. stat eccles. in prologo, & in glossa cont. decreta Cæsar. Ex Sur. An. 1531. 1539. *Pope of Recusamy p.* 31. 32. Magdeburg. præfat. Centur. 7. Caluin in c. 7 Amos.

LVTHER an Euangelist (as he termeth him selfe, or as other accompte him, an Apostle, a prophet, a third Elias, a beginner of protestantisme, in his booke of secular power condemneth those Princes, *who prescribe laws to their subiects in matter belonging to faith and the Church.* Magdeburgians his first, and cheefest childeren write thus. *Let not Magistrats be heads of the Church, because this Supremacy agreeth not to them.* Caluin saith, they were blasphemers who attributed the supremacy, to King Henry 8. And lest we shold think that only forayne Protestãts are of this opinion. Antony Gilby in his admonition to England and Scotland calleth King Henry a monstrous bore for taking the supremacy, that he displaced Christ, was no better then the Romish Antichrist, made him selfe a God. And lately Willet auoucheth. That *Bishops and Pastors haue a spiritual charge ouer Kings, & that Kings ought to yeeld obedience to those that haue ouer-*

Gilby.

VVillet cõtract. 791. part. 1. and 3. p. 269. 270.

sight

ſight of their ſoules. That *Heathen Princes had the ſame power, and authority in the Church which Chriſtian Princes haue*, and yet ſoone after affirmeth. That *heathen Princes cold not be heads of the Church, that is to haue the Soueraingty of external gouernment* Againe. That *the King is nether miſtical nor miniſterial head of the Church, that the name of head is vnproperly giuen to the Prince, and if any think it to great a name for any mortal man we wil not* (ſaith he) *greatly contend about it.* So we ſee he denyeth both name, and authority of the head of the Church to Kings.

Kings not ſo much is miniſterial heads of the Church by willet.

2. And his Maieſty perceaued that Reanolds, and his fellows aymed at a Scottish Presbitry (which agreeth with a Monarch, as wel as God, and the diuel page 79.) and acknowledged his ſupremacy only to make their partes good with Bishops, as Knox & his fellow miniſters in Scotland made his grandmother head of the Church therby to pul downe the Catholique Bishops. Yea that the whole English Clergy is in their harts of the ſame opinió, appeareth by their open profeſſion to agree in religion with forayne Proteſtants, who plainly deny the ſupremicy of Princes: by their writing and teaching, that Chriſt alone can behead of the Church: by their condemning Catholiques for attributing ſuch authority to man:

Conference p. 82. 83.

Apologia pag. 28.

and

and finally by their Synodical explication of the article of ſupremacy: which they expound thus. *That Princes ſhould rule al eſtates and degrees committed to their charge by God whether they be Eccleſiaſtical, or temporal, and reſtrayne with the ciuil ſword the ſtubborne, and euil doers,* wherein we ſee no power in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes granted to Princes, but only, ouer Eccleſiaſtical perſons. And we deny not that Princes haue any power ouer Eccleſiaſtical perſons, yea in the very canon of the Maſſe, as prieſts pray for *Papa noſtro N.* and *Antiſtite noſtro N.* for our Pope and Byſhop, ſo they pray for *Rege noſtro N.* acknowledging the one to be their King as the others to be their Prelates, and conſequently both to haue power ouer them. For as S. Auguſtin ſaid, and it is euident, *Rex à regendo dicitur*, a King is ſo called of power to gouerne. And as eccleſiaſtical perſons be ciuil or politique members of the common wealth, wherein they liue, ſo haue they the ſame politique or ciuil head which that commonwealth hath: for otherwiſe either ciuil members ſhould haue no ciuil head at al, which were monſtrous, or not be vnder the head of that body, whereof they be members, but onely vnder a ciuil head of an other body, which is impoſſible. Wherefore, what ſome ſay that Clergie men be exem-

Lib. 39. Artic. art. 37.

Auguſtin in Pſalm. 44. & 67.

See Stapelton relectione Controuerſiæ 2. q. 1. a. 1. ad 2. Victoria relectione de poteſta. eccleſiaſtica ſect. 7.

exempted from the power of Princes, is not to be vnderſtood vniuerſally but of their coactiue power which they haue to puniſhe the laity. And of late Bilſon Superintendent of Winton confeſſed to certeine Catholiques, (if I be not miſinformed) that the King is but *a ceremonial head*, that is either a head onely for faſhion ſake, or onely in matters of ceremonies, not in al eccleſiaſtical cauſes. And albeit they ſubſcribe to the ſupremacie, yet perhaps they doe that onely in reſpect of time, as a thouſand miniſters teſtifie, that diuerſe of them did to the communion booke, ſome vpon proteſtation, ſome vpon expoſition, ſome with condicion, albeit it conteyned (as they ſay) enormities, and abuſes not agreable to Scriptures, rather (forſooth) then the Church ſhould be depriued of their labours, but in deede rather then they ſhoulde be depriued of the Churches lyuings.

Supplicat. to the King in April 1603.

3 The true difference therfore betwixt Catholiques and English Proteſtants (if theſe durſt vtter their mindes as ſtrangers doe) would not be, whether the Prince or Pope, but whether the Pope or miniſters ought to be head of the Church, wherein I appeale to any indifferent mans iudgement, whether be more agreable to Gods word,

Matth. 16. Ioan. 21. word, that the succeſſour of S. Peter, vpon whome Chriſt built his church and committed his sheepe vnto, should be head of the Church, or they who are succeſſours to none but beginners of them ſelues, who (as S. Ciprian writeth) no man creating them Bishopes, made them ſelues Bishopes. And wether be more ſecure to Princes that he should be accounted head of Gods Church whom the whole Chriſtian world hath euer acknowledged for ſuch, and vnder whome the mightieſt Monarches haue and doe liue as ſecurely as any Proteſtant Prince whatſoeuer; or they, who if they were permitted would erect ſuch a Preſbitrie, *as agreeth with a Monarchy no better then the diuel with God, who haue kept Kings without ſtate and honor &c. and of whom ſome beardles boies haue braued Kings to their faces*, and excommunicated them when they came within ther pariſh.

Cyprian. lib. de ſimpl. prælat.

Conſtant. in edicto Conſtant. 5. Phocas. Iuſtinian. C. de ſumma Trinit. l. vlt. Valentinianus epiſt. ad Theodoſiñ. See cap. 6. parag. 6. 7. Conference p. 79. 4. and 20.

Chap. III.

The opinion of Proteſtants touching depoſition of Princes.

Germany. Luther. See Surius An. 1525. Prodromũ Staphil. p. 75. Likwise touching the depoſition of Princes, Luther as Sleidan teſtifieth wrote to Princes: *That ſubiects neither could, nor would, nor ought any longer, to ſuffer ther gouerment.* And benig asked his opinion touching the

the league of Protestans against their Emperor Charles 5. answered. *Because at this time so doubtful, & perilous, many things may hapen, that not only right it selfe, but necessity of consience may reach vs weapons, we may make league for defence, whither the Emperor him selfe, or any other make war.* And a litle before his death said; *VVho taks not armes whils he may, vseth not thongs giuen him by God.* And the Protestant Princes in their rebellion against the Emperor, set forth Proclamation wherein they write; *Because the Emperor endeauoreth to destroy religion & liberty, he giueth vs cause to assaile him with good consience* And againe *we renounce* (ô Emperor) *the faith and duty vvherwith vve are bound vnto thee.* This did German Protestants. Sleidon l. 8. Sur. An. 1531. Sur. An. 1548. Sleidon l. 22. lib. 17.

2. In Swiserland Zwinglius teacheth vs. That *vvhen the King shal deale perfidiously and beside the rule of Christ, he may in Gods name be deposed.* Againe *VVhiles naughty Kings are not deposed the vvhole people is punished of God.* And as for the Protestants of Sweueland their opinion is manifest by their excluding the Catholique King of Polād from succeding his late father: And the Holandish Protestants wholy, or cheefly defend their long rebellion against their Prince by coolor of religion. *Swiserland.* Zwingl. to. 1. art. 42. *Sweueland.* Mercur. Gallobelg. An. 1603. *Holland.*

3. In France Caluin their Arch-maister teacheth that *who reigneth not to serue Gods* *France.* Caluin. in epist. ante lib. institut.

glory,

glory, ruleth not but playeth the theefe. And in an other place. *Earthly Princes depose themselues whyls they rise against God, yea are vnworthy to be accounted men.* And his scholer Beza accounteth them Martyrs who dyed in batel against their King for religion, and at *Cabilon* in France 20. Ministers in a Synod decreed to distroy the Church, Nobility, & Magistrats. And againe at *Berna* 1572. set forth Canons of this matter and decreed Can. 3. *That in euery City al swore that they & their posterity shal obserue firme and inuiolated the points following.* Can. 40. *Vntil it shal please God in whose hands are the harts of Kings to change the hart of the French tyrant, and restore the state of the Kingdome to better order, & raise vp some neighbor Prince, whom we may know by his vertue & notable marks to be the deliuerer of this miserable people, in the meane tyme euery City shal choose a maior to gouerne them as wel in warre as peace* Can. 40. *Let al the Captains & leaders haue this axiome, as an vndoubted and most certain Oracle, neuer to trust to them* (the King and his) *who so often, and so notoriously haue broken their promise, the publike peace and quietnes. Nor euer let them lay downe weapons, as long as they shal see them persecute the doctrin of saluation, and the disciples of the same.* Item *But if the euil be incurable, if Gods wilbe to roote them* (natural Princes) *out, then if it please God*

In cap. 6. Daniel.

Beza in Præfat. Bibl. 1564. Pantaleon. Responsum trium ordinum Burgūdiæ 1563. Michael Fabritius ep. de Beza fal. 62.

Goodly Canons of Ministers.

Protestants fyrorne to rebel & depose Princes.

God to raise some Christian Prince to take reuenge of their sinnes, and deliuer his people, let them subiect them selues to that Prince, as to an other Cyrus sent to them from God. In the meane space let them gouerne them selues by these rules which we haue prescribed vnto them as lawes. Behould the verdit of French ministers assembled in Councel. O if such rules had bene made in Seminaries, what traitors and rebels had the authors bene? What exclamations would Bel and his fellow ministers haue made against them?

4. In Scotland Knox vttereth his, and his fellow ministers mind herein, in his appellation to the nobility & people of Scotland. *That I may say bouldly, the nobility, gouerners, iudges, and people of England ought not only to resist, and withstand. Mary Iezabel, whom they cal their Queene, but also put to death her, her Priests, and al others that ayded her, as soone as openly they began to suppresse Christs Gospel.* And he setteth downe titles of books which he would after publish, whereof the third is this. *If the people haue rashly preferred one manifestly wicked, or ignorātly chosen, such a one, who afterward sheweth him selfe vnworthy of gouernment ouer Christian people (for such are al Idolaters and cruel persecutors) the same people may most iustly depose, and punish him.*

Scotland.

Knox. p: 36.

Protestants bond to kil Princes by Knox.

p: 78.

5. Finally in England if we had asked *England.*

our miniſters of what minde they were, while the Septer and ſword was in Catholique hands. Goodman in his booke intituled how we ought to obey ſuperior Magiſtrats, telleth vs: *But if they* (Prince & Magiſtrats *do boldly tranſgreſſe Gods lawes, and command the ſame to others, then haue they loſt that honor, and obedience which otherwiſe ſubiects were bound to giue them, nor are hereafter to be accounted Magiſtrats, but to be punished as priuat men.* But who muſt punish them? he anſwereth the common people. *If the Prince and al Magiſtrats do reſiſt Gods law, you people haue expreſſe teſtimony of Gods vvord for your part, and God him ſelfe vvilbe your Captaine, & leader, vvho commandeth not only Peers, and Magiſtrats to take euery euil from them ſelues, whither idolatry, blaſphemy or open iniury, but requireth this of the vvhole multitude to vvhome the ſvvord of iuſtice is in part committed. VVherfore if al Magiſtrats together vvil deſpiſe iuſtice and Gods lavves, it is your part (o comon people) to defend and conſerue them vvith as much violence and ſtrife as you can againſt Magiſtrats, and al others. For this God requireth of you.* Exod: 17. *this burden lieth vpon the vvhole people to punish euery idolater vvhatſoeuer none is excepted, vvhither King, Queene, or Emperor.* And a litle after *That fact is recounted number 25, it is a perpetual example for al eternity, and a certayne and ſure*

Goodman c. 9. p. 118.

See Couel of Church gouernment. cap. 4 p. 35. howv this doctrin vvas Caluins & the learnedeſt Proteſtants of that tyme. c. 13 p. 180. 181. 184.

Princes muſt be hãged accordinig to Goodman.

ſure denouncement to the people that in like renoult from the vvorship of God, they do carry to the gallous, and hang their gouernors, vvho lead them from God.

6. And in particulat touching Wyats rebellion he ſaith. *None but Papiſts can accuſe VVyat of treaſon, or diſobedience, it vvas the duty of VVyat & al others that amongſt you profeſſe Chriſts Goſpel, to take in hand that vvarre, and they vvere true traytors, vvho ether kept not promiſe to him, or ayded not his part. O moſt noble VVyat thou novv liueſt vvith God, and theſe noble men vvho dyed vvith thee in that cauſe. Tea noble men and Counſellers did not you condemne your ſelues as manifeſt and baſe minded traytors not only to VVyat, but euen to God him ſelfe? O Goſpellers is this the loue of Gods vvord you pretend, haue you ſo learned the Goſpel?* l. 14 p. 205.

Proteſtants duty to rebel according to Goodman.

Traiters vvho do not rebel according to Goodman.

7. And albeit miniſters hauing now gotten the Prince on their ſide, do in words cõdemne Goodman, yet that their minde abhorreth not from this opinion, may appeare *by the partial, vertue and ſeditions notes, & to much fauoringe of dangerous, and trayterous conceipts as of allovving diſobedience to Kings, and taxing Aſa for depoſing his mother, and not killing her* which his Majeſty obſerued in their English Bybles, And thus I hope the Reader ſeeth that Bel had litle cauſe to charge Papiſts alone with depoſition of Princes, but

Conference p. 47.

much better wil he see it, if we compare Papists and Protestants opinions herein together.

1. Knox Good man. sup: 2.

8. Catholiques say, Kings may be deposed, Protestants say, they may be deposed and hanged: Catholiques say, it should be done after due tyme, and admonition giuen, & the Lateran Councel prescribeth a years respit: Protestants say, so soone as they begin to suppresse Christs Gospel: Catholikes say, it must be done by the Pope the Kings spiritual Pastor and Father: who as a Father louingly, and as a Prince aduisedly, and as a stranger dispassionatly, wil proceed in so weighty a matter; Protestants say, it may be done by cõmon people the Kings owne subiects, who as common people rashly and headely, and as subiects insolently and passionatly, are like to behaue them selues in controuling and correcting their Prince, as the lamentable examples hereafter touched can testify. Besides what Catholiques say of Kings, the same they say of the Pope, that he may as wel be deposed for heresy, or infidelity, as Princes; and what they say vnder an heretical Prince, they defend vnder a Catholique. Whereas Protestants change their tune according as the Prince fauoreth or disfauoreth their religion. Now let vs see the practise of Protestants.

Lateran: 3. c. 3. de Hæret: Knox sup: 3.

Goodman. sup:

4.

Note this in differency of Catholiques and partiality of Protestants.

The

CHAP. IIII.
The practiſe of Proteſtants touching depoſition of Princes

CONFORMABLE to their doctrin haue bene the practiſes of Proteſtants. For in Germany vnder pretence of religion, *Germany.* firſt the common people being Proteſtants roſe againſt the nobles, in which inſurrection there were an hundred thouſand of the common people ſlayne, many caſtles and towares ſpoyled, and burnt. And ſoone after the nobles roſe againſt their Emperor, gathered an army of eighty thouſand foote, ten thouſand horſe, and 130. feeld peces. And George Duke of Saxony wrote to Luther, that there was neuer more rebellions againſt Magiſtrats then through his Goſpel: And Eraſmus a holy Confeſſor in Foxes calender, giueth this teſtimony of them. *Many diſciples of Luther are ſo vnapt to publike quiet, as the Turk is ſaid to deteſt the name of Lutherans for ſedition: Teſtimonium hoc verum eſt?*

Sleidon. l. 4. 17. 19. Sur: An: 1522. 1525.

Sur: An: 1530. 1534.

Apud Sleid. Et ſur: 1536.

Eraſmus l. 3. de lib: arbit:

2. In Swiſerland Zwinglius togeather with Proteſtantiſme ſowed ſedition, and brought his country to three pitcht battels in one moneth, and was him ſelfe ſlayne in one of them. In Denmark Proteſtantiſme *Swiſerland.* Sur: An: 1531. *Denmark.*

Staphil. apol. art. 3. was no ſooner ſettled, then the Commons roſe againſt the nobles & the nobles againſt

Sur. An. 1532. their King, whom they depoſed, and after long banishment caſt into priſon, whereas

Sweueland. it is reported they poyſned him. In Sweueland the Proteſtants haue lately excluded

Mercur. Gallobelg. An. 1603. their natural, lawful, and crowned Prince, the preſent King of Poleland, and choſen

Holland. his vncle. In Flanders, they elected Francis Duke of Alanſon for their Prince, and haue depriued two of their lawful Princes, from a great part of the Low countries, & made warre againſt them almoſt 40. yeares.

France. 3. In France Proteſtants haue rebelled againſt three of their natural and anoynted

Genebrard. chron. Kings, Francis 2: Charles. 9. Henry 3. they

Sur. An. 1563. Furores Gallici. tooke by treaſon, or force, many of their cheefeſt cities, Roane, Orleans, Lyons and

Michael Fabritius in epiſt. de Beza. others, made league with the enimies of France, and giuen townes into their hands, they haue leuied great armies of ſubiects, brought in great bands of Strangers, and fought foure mayne battels againſt their King, they depoſed their King and choſe an other, and coyned money in his name with

Sur. An. 1560. title of *the firſt Chriſtian King of France*, They opened the tombs of two of their Kings & burnt their bones. They conſpired to murder the King & two Queenes, his wife and his mother, with his brethren & nobility,

and

and had executed their designments, if they had not bene preuented by their massacre. They slew the King of Nauar, Father to the French King now regnant. And their horrible outrages in al kinde of dishonesties, cruelties, and Sacrileges are vnspeakable. Fabritius sup. fol. 64, 66.

4. In Scotland the Protestants first took armes against the Queene dawager, Grand mother to his Majesty, then regent of Scotland, and by their rebellions, and tumults hastened her death, which his Majesty greatly lamented in the conference. Likwise after infinit indignities, and perils they driue Queene Mary of blessed memory his Majesties Mother, their natural and lawful Prince out of her kingdo me, and country, forced her to surrender her crowne and Scepter to a bastard, murthered her husband his Maiesties Father, and therof infamed her wrongfully (as was proued at her iudgment in England) had murdred both her selfe and his Maiestie then in her womb, if a charged pistole put to her womb would haue giuen fyer. And at last by Protestants she was put to death against law of nations, And his Maiesty cõfesseth of him selfe that in Scotland *he vvas a King vvithout state, vvithout honor, vvithout order, vvhere beardles boyes vvould braue him to his face, and keept for the most part as a vvard.* And in what present danger Scotland. Sur. An. 1560. Conference p. 81. Confer p. 8 and 20.

he was of being murdered by the Protestant Earle Gowry and his brethren, no man is ignorant. And otherwhere gratiously acknowlegeth, *That he found none more faithful to him selfe, then such as had bene faithful to his mother* (who were Papists) *and them he found faithles to him selfe, who had bene such to his mother*: and an honorable person yet liuing and worthy of credit, and hard it, can testify that Queene Eelizabeth did oftentymes say to my Lord Moũtague a famous Catholique of worthy memory. *That if she fel into danger, she would sooner put her life into his hands, and others of his profession, then of any other subiect she had.* And if Queene Elizabeth (though she were far more seuere towards her Catholique subiects then al Protestant Princes together haue hiterto bene towards theirs) did neuertheles put more affiance and trust in them, euen after she had bene deposed of the Pope, then in any Protestant, what assurance may that Prince haue of the loyalty and fidelity of Catholiques, who hath vsed great lenity towards them, and nether is, nor like to be deposed of the Pope.

Basilicon doron.

Q. Eliz. wwoords & confidence of Catholiks.

His Maiesties speech to the Parlament 19 Mart. 1603. England.

5. Finally in England Protestants rebelled twise, & that in one yeare against their Queene Mary; once vnder the conduct of the Dukes of Northumberland, & Suffolk, erect-

erecting a falſe Queene, & ſo excluding as much as lay in them, the Succeſſion of his Maieſty. And againe vnder Wyat, and at both times ſhe was defended by Catholiks. The things I rather touch then relate, becauſe they are freſh in memory of many, or to be found in many hiſtories.

Proteſtants and Catholiques practiſe compared.

6. Now let vs compare the practiſe of Proteſtants touching the depoſition of Princes, with the practiſe of the Pope, ſince the tyme that Proteſtants began. They haue within this 70 yeares partely depoſed partly attempted, as far as lay in thir power, one Emperor, three French Kings, two Kings of Spaine, one of Denmarke, one of Pole-land, one Queene of England, and one of Scotland. They haue ſlayne one King of Nauar, one of Denmarke, one Queene of Scotland, one Queenes huſband, and burnt the bodies of two other Kings, & attẽpted to murder one French King, two French Queenes, & one King of Scotland. Whereas the Popes neuer ſlew any Prince at al, but haue ſaued the liues, & kingdomes of many, & ſince Proteſtãts began, haue depoſed one onely King Henry 8. and one Queene Elizabeth and ſpared both King Edward, the 6. & many Kings of Dẽmark, & Sweuland, beſids a great number of German Princes. And his Maieſtie is ſo far from danger of being

1 *Carolus 5.*
2 *Francis 2.*
3 *Carolus 9.*
4 *Henricus 3.*
5 *Philippus 2.*
6 *Philippus 3.*
7 *Chriſtiernus.*
8 *Sigiſmundus.*
9 *Maria Ang.*
10 *Maria Scot.*

See D. Giffords commission and Monſ. Bethunes letters. Proclamation 22. Februar. anno 1.

being depoſed by him, as he hath already cenſured al thoſe that moleſte, or diſturbe his maieſty; and his maieſty, gratefully acknowledgeth him ſelfe *beholden to the Pope for his temporal cariage, and diuers kind offices towards him*, euen then when ther was leſſe cauſe of ſuch kindnes, then now is. Yea which is a point worthy of conſideration.

Note this.

Neuer did any Pope depoſe any King, or Prince merely for not profeſſing the Catholique religion, if he had not before embraced it; If any obiect, that the Pope hath beſide King Henry, and Queene Elizabeth depoſed the preſent French King, I anſwer that it was before he had the Crowne of France, and was onely *titulo tenus* King of Nauar; beſids that the Pope vpon his amendment hath both reſtored him to his dignity, and shewed him many great, and extraordinary fauors. And thus much of Bels diſſembling the opinion, and practiſe of Proteſtants, touching the Supremacy or depoſition of Princes. Now let vs come to his proofs of his Aſſumprion.

Chap. V.

Bells proofes of his Aſſumption anſwered.

Bells proofs of his Aſſumption I might let paſſe, as nothing perrayning to vs,

to vs, seeing we teach no such doctrin as he therin affirmeth to be false: Neuertheles because the Reader may iudge, whither he be a more fond disputor or false reportor, I wil set them downe and answer them seuerally. His first proofe is out of *their famous* (saith he) *Pope Gregory the great* lib: 2. epist. 61. where writing to the Emperor Mauritius, he calleth him. *Soueraigne Lord, and professeth himselfe subiect to his command, and to owe him obedience.* Whereupon Bel inferreth that for 600 years after Christ, Popes liued vnder Emperors in al dutiful obedience, that is (as he vnderstandeth) in al causes Ecclesiastical and ciuil. Bel p. 24

2. Marke (good Reader) how many and how grosse errors he committeth in this one silly proofe. First he sheweth smal skil in chusing Authors for his purpose, because none make more against him in this matter then S. Gregory. For he is the first P. whome we find to haue made a flat decree touching the deposition of Princes in these words. *If any King, Prelat, Iudge, or seculer person of what degree or highnes soeuer* (do violate the priuileges of S. Medards monastery) *let him be deposed.* And vpon the 4. al: 5. pœnit: psalme he writeth that no reason alloweth him to be King who alienateth men from Christ and enthralleth his Church: and lib. 12. epist. vlt. lib. 11. epist. 10.

sharply

sharply inueigheth againſt the Emp: for vſurping right of earthly power ouer the Church of Rome, which he calleth the head of al Churches and Lady of Nations, and telleth him that it were better for him to acknowledge her his Lady, and ſubmit him ſelfe to her according to the example of godly Princes.

Anſwer. 3. And as for the place which Bel citeth he ſpeaketh not there of the ſubiection, duty, or obediēce of a ſubiect to his Prince, but of a ſeruant to his Maiſter (as he had bene to Mauritius whiles they were both priuat men) which him ſelfe plainly profeſſeth in the beginning of his letter in theſe words. *In this ſuggeſtion I ſpeake not as Biſhop, nor as ſubiect, by reaſon of the common wealth, but by priuat right of my owne, becauſe you haue bene my Lord ſince that time when as yet you were not Lord of al.* And therfore by the forſayd words he meaneth no otherwiſe, then a louing ſeruant doth, when vpon curteſie to his old Maiſter though he haue left him, yet he ſtil calleth him Maiſter, and offereth him ſelfe and his ſeruice at his command. His ſecond error was, in inferring vpon the bare words of one P. ſpeaking of him ſelfe alone, not onely his dutiful obedience, but alſo of al his Predeceſſors for 600. years together. He would eſpie his error, if I ſhould

infer

infer the ſame of al. S. Greg: his ſucceſſors for 600. years after him. And though euery Engliſh Prieſt do cal his Maieſty Soueraigne Lord, profeſſe them ſelues ſubiect to his commande, and to owe him obedience, as far as Bel can shew that euer S. Gregory did to the Emp: yet wil he not ſuffer me to infer that they liue in al dutiful obedience to their Prince, but wil condemne them al of high treaſon. For with him (as of old with Donatiſts) *Quod volumus ſanctum eſt.*

4. His 3. error is, in granting that Popes for 600. years after Chriſt, liued in al dutiful obedience to Emperors, wherein he quite ouerthroweth what he ment to proue in this Article. For if that be true, he can not thinke that to excommunicate or depoſe Princes vpon great cauſes, is againſt the duty of Popes. Becauſe (to omit S. Ambroſe his excõmunicating of the Emperors Theodoſius & Maximus, & S. Babilas his excõmunicating an other Emp: whom *he droue* (ſaith S. Chriſoſt) *out of the Church as if he had bene a baſe ſlaue & of no account*) no fewer then fiue or ſix Popes haue excõmunicated their Emperors in that time. As S. Fabian excõmunicated Phillip the firſt Chriſtian Emperor S. Innocent 1. the Emperours Arcadius and Eudoxia, P. Symachus & P. Anaſtaſius, and (as ſome ſay) P. Gelaſius excommunicated

Contradict. Gelaſ. epiſt. ad Anaſtaſ. Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 18. Sozom. l. 7. c. 24. Paulin. in vit. Ambroſ. Lib. cont. Gentil. Euſeb. lib. 6. c. 36. Niceph. lib. 13. c. 39. Gelaſ. d. 26. con. Duo ſunt. Georg. Partiarcha in vit. Chryſoſt. Symach. ep. ad Anaſtaſ. Stapleto. de Eccl. Rom. Platina in Gelaſio.

XUM

Baron. An. 584. Contradict. cated the Emperor Anastasius, and P. Vigil the Empresse Theodora. And S. Gregory him selfe proceeded further (as you heard) euen to depose Princes. Moreouer Bel writeth p: 8. that Barbarians possessed al Italy from the yeare 471. vntil Charles the great 801. How then saieth he here that Popes liued vnder Emperors vntil 603.

5. His fourth error is in cõfessing S. Gregory the great to be ours, that is, a Papist, whereupon follow many things to his vtter confusion. First that the old Rom. religion (for I hope what is aboue a 1000. yeares old is old) which him selfe p: 83. confesseth to be *Catholique, sound, & pure*, is Papistical. 2. That the first Christian religion which our English Anceitours (hauing bene euer before bondslaues (saith S. Beda l. 2. c. 1. of Idols) receaued from S. Gregory by his legat S. Austin, was Papistical. 3. That al Christendome was in S. Gregories time, Papistical, because it communicated with him in faith and religion as is euident by his Epistles written to al partes of Christendome. Thus we see this mans smal wit in proouing his vntruthes: Now let vs see his good wil.

Belpag. 3. S. Ignat. ep. ad Mariam Cassab. 6. Very loth he is to graunt the Pope the name of Pope, which Saints, Councels, Princes, Catholiques, & Schismatiks haue euer

euer giuen him. *Bishops of Rome* (saith he) *now called Popes.* And when not Syr? did not S. Ignatius who liued in the Apostles tyme cal S. Anacletus Pope? did not also S. Iustin euen as the Magdeburgians confesse? did not S. Austin, S. Hierome, S. Ambrose, Vincent: Lirin: & others aboue a thousand yeares a goe? did not the Councel of Calcedon, of Carthage, of Mileui of Epirus? do not the Gretians cal the Bishop of Rome Pope. Was he not alwaies called Pope as wel in England as in al Christendome, els vntil the 26. yeare of Henry 8. when hauinge reuoulted from the Popes obedience, he commanded this name to be razed out of al writings calendaries, & Holy Doctors whatsoeuer.

S. Iustin. ep. ad zenam & seren. S. Aug. epist. 92. 95. 261. S. Hiero. ep. ad Damas. Amb. ep. 81. Vincēt. cont. hæres. liberatus in breuiar. cap. 22. Concil. Calcedon. act. 16. Carthag. & Mileuit. apud August. ep. 90. & 91. Epirot. ep. ad Hermis. Constantin. in edicto. Galli Placidici epist. ad Pulcheriam Chouiatæ. Vide epist. trium Concil. Africon. ad Damas. to. 1. Camil.

7. And a maruailous thing it is to consider the contradictious spirit of Protestants. They wil cal vs nothing but Papists (as Arians called Catholique Romans) and our religion Popish, which are bynames inuented of them selues, and deriued from the name of Pope; and yet wil they not cal him Pope, which hath bene his name euer since the Apostles time. And thus much touching Bels proose of his Assumption out of S. Gregory.

Protestants cal vs Papists of the Pope & yet wil not cal him Pope.

Victor de persecut. vandalica. lib. 1. Bel p. 1. Gregor. Turon. de glor. mart. cap. 28. 30. & 79.

8. Next he alleadgeth S. Ambrose saying *Dauid being King Was subiect to no human law.*

But

But (beſids that the word (*human*) is not in that place) S. Ambroſe freeth Kings onely from penalty of ciuil or temporal lawes. For how ſubiect he thought them to be to Eccleſiaſtical lawes, appeareth by his excommunicating the Emperors Thodoſius, and Maximus; beſide that Conſtantin and Valentinian profeſſed them ſelues to be vnder Bishops. And doubtles the human lawes enacted by the Apoſtles Act: 15. v. 18 and 1. Cor: 7. v. 12. exempted no more Princes then priuat perſons; S Hierome, Bel affirmeth to teach the ſame that S. Ambroſe: but neither alledgeth his wordes, nor quoteth ether booke, or chapter, perhaps becauſe he made leſſe shew for him.

Bonus imperator intra non ſupra eccleſiã eſt. Ambr. epiſt. 32. Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 18. Sozomen. l. 7. c. 24. Paulin. in vita Ambroſ. Ruffin. lib. 1. c. 2. Theodoret. lib. 4. cap. 5.

9. Euthimius he citeth becauſe he writeth. *That Dauid as a King had God onely iudge ouer his ſinnes.* But he meaneth of a temporal iudge as doe alſo the Gloſſe, and lira cited by him. And though S. Thomas proue of ſet purpoſe. That the Pope may depoſe Princes, yet is not Bel ashamed to cite him becauſe he ſaith 1. 2. q. 96. art. 5. *That a King is not ſubiect to compulſion of his owne lavvs.* As if therfore he were ſubiect to no law. Hereafter the Reader neede not maruail to ſee Bel citing Scriptures, and Fathers for his purpoſe, ſeing he abſtayneth not from his profeſſed aduerſaries. For with him al is fish that

Bel p. 3. Euthym. in Pſalm. 50. Gloſſa ordin. & lyra in Pſalm. 50. S. Thom. 2. 2. q. 12. art. 2.

comes to net, and as litle make the one for him, as the other. Laſtly he citeth Hugo Card : writing. *That God alone is aboue al Kings.* But this is ment in temporalibus as before we cited out of Innocent. 3.

Hugo Card. in pſal. 50. *cap.* 1.

10. After theſe proofs of his Aſſumption Bel hudleth vp ſix vntruthes togeather ſaying. *The good Kings Ioſue, Dauid, Salomon, Ioſaphat, Ezechias, and Ioſias knew right wel they had authority aboue al Prieſts : and therfore tooke vpon them not onely to command & control them; but alſo to depoſe euen the high Prieſts them ſelues.* For proofe of theſe vntruthes he referreth vs to his Golden Balance, and I refer him for confutation of them, to Doctor Stapletons Conterblaſt againſt Horns vaine blaſt, & his Relection con: 2. q: 5: ar. 1. Onely I ſay that Ioſue was no King, nor the Scripture affordeth any colour of ſaying that any high Prieſt was depoſed by any of the ſaid Kings, except Abiathar by Solomõ 3. reg: c. 2: v. 35. et. 27. And yet (as it is gathered out of the 4. chapter where he is accounted Prieſt in Salomons raigne) Salomon depoſed him not, but onely for a time confyned him to his howſe for his conſpiracy with Adonias, and ſo debarred him from executing his Prieſtly function. And though he had depoſed him he had not done it as King, but as Prophet fulfilling as the Scripture teſti-

Bel p. 4. 5.

Vntruthes 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

3. *Reg.* 4. v. 4.

3.Reg.2.7. 27. fyeth the Prophiſy againſt the howſe of Hely, from whence Abiathar deſcended. And this is al which Bel obiecteth againſt the Popes ſuperiority ouer Princes. Now let vs ſee how he anſwereth one obiection of Catholique in anſwers wherof he ſpendeth the reſt of this article.

Chap. VI.

Bels anſwer to an argument of Catholiques for the Popes authority, confuted.

Bel p.5. BEL for better ſatisfaction (as he ſaith) of the vulgar ſorte propoundeth one obiection of Catholiques, but yet ſo nakedly, and without al forme or fashion of argument (ſetting downe an Antecedent without any conſequent) that therby one may gheſſe he meaneth nothing leſſe then to frame (as he promiſſeth) a plaine, and fincer ſolution vnto it. And yet the obiection though ſo ſillily propounded, not onely much trobleth many vulgar people (as he ſaith) but puſleth him ſelfe ſo, as after ſeuen leaues ſpent to diuert the Readers minde, & to make him forget (as Heritiks vſe to do) the argument, which he can not anſwer, he fyndeth no better ſolution, then to graunt what the Antecendent con-

The manner of Protestants in anſwering Catholiks.

contayneth and to say nothing to the consequent following therof.

2. Wherfore becauſe Bel was ſo trobled with the matter of this obiection, as he forgot the forme, I wil ſupply his default, and argue thus in forme. He by whoſe authority the Empire was tranſlated, the electors of the Emperor appointed, and the elected is confirmed, and whoſe ſuperiority ouer them many Emperors haue willingly acknowledged, hath ſome ſuperiority ouer Emperors: but the Pope is ſuch, as by his authority the Empire &c. Ergo the Pope hath ſome ſuperiority ouer Emperors. The forme is ſyllogiſtical and good. The Propoſition is manifeſt, for no power or dignity can be truly tranſlated, or confirmed by inferiors or equals, but onely by ſuperiors: none (eſpecially) willingly acknowledge as ſuperior, whome they thinke is not.

3. The Aſſumption contayneth three parts expreſſed in the Propoſition, wherof the firſt vz. That the Empire was tranſlated by the Popes authority Bellarm: l. de tranſl: Imper: c. 4. proueth by the teſtimony of 33. writers & c. 5. by the confeſſion of 11. Emperors: and Princes, and c. 6. by aſſertion of 7. Popes. Yea Bel (though with much a doe) confeſſeth it page. 12. ſaying. *That Charles the great* (to whome the Empire was *Bellarmin.*

first translated) *was made Emperor by Pope Leo 3. for restoring him to his place, and dignity,* p. 13. *being driuen out by the Romans*, though soone after he condemne the Pope of treason for this translation. But differring the question of treason til a non (which hindreth not the verity of the translation if the translator haue power to transfer: as a souldier may by gift, or sale truly, and yet trayterously translate his armes, and munition to the Enemies) I ask of Bel, whether the Pope did truly translate the Empire, or no. If he did, then hath the Pope power to translate Empires: If he did not, then was nether Charles the great, nor any of his successors to this day true Emperors. And if the Pope be Antichrist (as Bel auoucheth) for deposing some few Emperors for iust causes; Bel may be wel accounted Lucifer, for deposing at once, and for no fault at al, the Emperors of the west, which haue bene these 800. yeares. But Protestants haue great cunning in making and vnmaking Emperors, according as it redoundeth in their opinion to the grace or disgrace of Popes. For when the Pope deposeth them, they be true Emperors, but when he maketh them, *they haue onely* (as Willet writeth) *the name title, and image of Emperors.* But let them answer this dilemma. These Emperors whom the

Protestants can make & vnmake Emperors when they list.

Willet Contract. 4. q. 10. p. 178.

the Pope deposed since Carolus Magnus, were true or false Emperors? If false, he did a good deed in deposing them: If true, then hath the Pope authority to make true Emperors, and translate Empiers.

Likewise when will-let list the imperial authority is in the Pope loc. scit. But when he list not, he is no temporal Prince. ib. q. 8. p. 154 155.

4. The second parte included in my Assumption vz. That the Pope appointed the electors of the Emperor, and confirmed the elected, touching the apointing of electors is confessed by Bel pag. 14. and touching the confirmation is contested by many histriographers, and practized by as many as are crowned Emperors. The last parte vz, that Emperors haue acknowledged the Popes superiority Bel him self confesseth page 17. where he sayth, *That some Christian Kings and Emperors haue vpon a blynd Zeale humbled them selues to the Pope*, yea (which is more) *haue yeldeed vp their soueraigne rights to him.* And shal not the Pope be superior to them, who haue humbled them selues & yeelded their soueraingties vnto him?

pag. 17. O dolor fraudata sunt tali magisterio tempora antiqua. August. lib. 1. cont. Gaudens. c. 19.

5. But what shift hath Bel to auoide this? forsooth that those Christian Princes were blynd. O most blynd answerer? not seing that he graunteth more then his aduersary requireth. Catholiques argue that Kings, and Emperors haue acknowledged Popes their superiors, this Bel graunteth in confessing their humiliation to Popes, which is

neuer done, but to Superiors. and addeth that they haue yeelded vp their Souereigne rights, which is more then the obiection contayneth. And what he addeth of blynd zeale maketh nothing to the purpose. Because the question is not vpon what cause Kings, and Emperors humbled them selues to the Popes, but whither they did or no. And because they haue so done (as Bel confesseth) Catholiques infer the Pope to be their Superior. Vnles perhaps Bel think blynd zeale to disanul euery fact, or gift, and so say the Iewes persecuted not the Church, because they did it vpon blynd zeale. Ro. 10. v. 2. nor our Catholike aũcetors gaue any liuings to Churches, because they did it vpon blynd zeale (as Bel must think) for maintenance of Papistry. Neuertheles because the Reader may see whither is more likly to be blind, a dooble turne coate Minister, or so many Princes as haue humbled them selues to Popes, I wil name onely a few Emperors, omitting for breuity sake both Christian Kings, and the heathen Attilas miraculously made to reuerence Pope Leo.

Cassiodor. Miscell. vid. Baron. anno 452. Euseb. lib. 6. c. 25. Nicephor. lib. 13. c. 34.

6. Philippe the first Christian Emperor about the yeare 246. reuerenced Pope Fabian. Constantin worthely (saith Bel) syrnamed the great held the stirrop to Pope Siluester

Bel p. 173. Edictũ Constantini.

Silueſter about the yeare 323. Soone after in S. Ambroſe and S. Chriſoſtomes tyme as them ſelues witnes *Emperors bowed their necks euen to Prieſts knees and layd their heads vnder their hands*, the ſame teſtifieth Pope Gelaſius of Anaſtaſe Emperor of his tyme, and S. Gregory of Emperors before his tyme. Iuſtin about the yeare 525. humbled him ſelf to the ground to Pope Ihon 1. Iuſtinian 534. humbled him ſelf to Pope Agapet and worshiped him. Iuſtinian the ſecond about the yeare 710. kiſſed the feet of Pope Conſtantin. Ihon Paleologus wold haue kneeled to Pope Eugenius 4. in the yeare 1438. And thus did the Emperors of the Eaſt.

S. Ambr. de dignit. ſacerd. c. 2. Chriſoſto. hom. 4. & 5. in illud Iſaiæ. vidi Dominum. *The like S. Hilary. l. cont. Conſtant.* Gelaſ. 1. ep. ad Anaſtaſ. S. Greg. in 4. Pſal. pænit. Baron. anno 536. ex Anaſtaſ. Miſcell. zonora. Naucler. General. 18.

7. Of the weſtern Emperors Charles the great about the yeare 773. cold not be held by Pope Adrian 1. from kiſſing his feete. Lewis his ſone ſent the honorableſt of his court to meet Pope Steuen 4. him ſelf went a myle and as ſoone as he ſaw him, lighting from his horſe, with great veneration brought him into the city in the yeare 817. Lewis 2. went a myle to meet Pope Nicolas 1. and putting his hand to his horſes brydle brought him into his Camp about the year 860. Henry 3. 1077. barefooted in the depth of winter attended vpon Gregory 7. Henry 4. 1111. kiſſed the feet of Pope Paſcal 2. Frederick 1. about the year

Platina in Cõſtantino, Naucler. general. 24. Concil. Florent. per Iouerium. Platina in Adrian. 1. Naucler. general. 26. Centur. 8. c. 10. col. 724. Platida in Stephan. 4. Naucler. general. 28. Platina in Nicolao 1. Platina in Gregor. 7. Naucler. general. 36.

Platina in Pascali 2. Naucler. general. 38. Platin. in Adrian. 4. Alexand. 3. Naucler. gener. 40. Onuphrius in chron. Plat. in Ioā. 22. Naucler. general. 48. Surius in cōmentar.

1155. held the stirrop to Pope Adrian 4. and 1177. kissed the feete of Pope Alexander 3. Sigismund 1418. prostrate on the ground, with most great veneration kissed the feete of Pope Martin 5. Charles the 5. 1530. 1538. kissed the feete of P. P. Clement 7. & Paul 3. and wold haue held the stirrop of Pope Clement 7. of al these Christian Emperors it is recorded in publik histories how they humbled them selues to Popes, and of no Catholique Christian Emperor is written that he refused to do the like.

8. Let now any indifferent Reader be iudge, whither the Pope haue reason to think him self to be Superior to Christian Emperors, seing so many, and they the most wise, most valiant, and most famous, of al, euen the very first and last of them, haue acknowledged him their Superior. And whither it be likly that. Bel shold see, and al these Christian Emperors together with their Counsellors, Nobles, Prelats, Diuins, & Commons, be blind; yea so blind as they shold not see that their humiliation to the Pope *opened the Window* (sayth Bel) *to al Antichristian tyrany.* p. 17.

9. Vsual it is for Heretiks to condemne not onely former Catholiques, but euen Heritiks of blindnes if they disagree from them: So the Caluinist condemneth the Lutherian, See S. Austin lib 2. cont. Iul. c. 10. 10, 7.

XUM

therian, the Puritan ſaith the ſame of the Proteſtant, the Brouniſt of the Puritan. And King Edward, ſixtimes cõdemned K. Henries religion of blindnes, and thoſe found the like meaſure in Queene Elizabeths time, and ſhe had fared a like, if more then a thouſand miniſters, who condemne her proceding of Enormities, Superſtitions and abuſes contrary to Scripture, had obtayned their petition. But of them al we may ſay as Tertullian ſaid of Heritiks in his time. *To theſe alone, and to theſe firſt was the truth reuealed forſooth, they obtayned greater fauor, and fuller grace of the diuil.* For light they haue but ſuch as cometh from him who *transfigureth himſelfe into an angel of light*, and brag of it til as the Kings maieſty ſaid of the Scottish miniſters) *they goe made with their owne light.* And thus much of the Catholiques obiection and Bels anſwer therto. Now let vs come to his ſlounderous vntruthes.

Petition exhibited to his Maieſty in April 1603.

Tertull. lib. de præſcrip.

2. Cor. 11. v. 14.

Conference p. 71.

CHAP. VII.

Some of Bels ſlaunderous vntruthes diſproued.

BEL perceauing that the ſlightnes of his forſaid anſwer would haue eaſely appeared, if it had bene ſet down immediatly after the Catholiques obiection, without daze-

dazeling the Readers eyes before with ſome other matter, though beſt before he anſwered it to ſlander both Pope and Papiſts, and to tel the Reader a long tale of ſteps deuiſed by him ſelfe, in an imaginary ladder of his owne. *Many abſurd things* (ſaith he) *haue bene affirmed by Popes paraſits for aduancement of his primacy.* If one aske him? what theſe abſurd things are, & who were theſe paraſits. He nameth none. For *doloſus verſatur in generalibus.* But let vs heare him proue his ſaying *As Victoria doth teſtify in theſe words. Sed gloſſatores iuris hoc dominion &c. The gloſſors of the law haue giuen this dominion to the Pope, they being poore in ſubſtance, and learning.*

pag 5.

11. vntruthe. Victoria de poteſtate eccleſiæ relect. 1. ſect. 6.

2. Here in ſteed of proofs I find an vntruth. For nether doth Victoria in theſe words ſpeake of many things, but onely of this dominion (meaning temporal ouer the world) nether yet doth he cal it abſurd. This want therfore Bel thought to ſupply of his owne ſtore, and therfore Englishing Victorias words, he addeth (*and theſe lordly titles*) and then as hauing a ſure foundation, he rayſeth his lie ſomewhat higher, ſaying. *That Victoria affirmeth, ignorance and pouerty were the beginning of al lordly Popery.* Wheras Victoria ſpeaketh onely of temporal dominion ouer the whole world, and Bel him ſelfe herafter maketh Kings and Emperors authors

When he ſpeaketh a lye he ſpeaketh of his owne. Ioan. 8. v. 44.

12 vntruth.

Bel p. 17. 4. Contradict.

authors of the Popes dominion. *Bel p. 7.*

3. Hauing thus dealt with Victoria he falleth to ſlander the late Popes ſaying. *That they haue challenged more then human, and royal power euen that power which is due & proper to God alone.* True it is that both late & ancient Popes haue challēged more then human, & royal power. For ſuch is al ſpiritual power as shal hereafter be proued. But moſt falſe it is that any Pope aunciēt or late, challengeth any power proper to God, or that any Catholique attributeth ſuch power vnto him. As his brother willet telleth him in theſe words *The Pope by their owne confeſſion can not do al that Chriſt did.* But what ſay you Sir to Caluin attributing duine power to Magiſtrats? And to Proteſtants *arrogating greater, more intolerable, and les excuſable authority and power, then euer the Pope did, as Melanthon* writeth, or to other calling Princes Gods, as you shal heare a none. Now let vs ſee what proofs he bringeth of his ſlander. Gerſon (ſaith he) *reporteth that ſome Popish paraſits ſay that Chriſt hath giuen al that power in heauen and earth, to S. Peter, and his ſucceſſors which was giuen to himſelfe, and that he hath written in the Popes thighe King, of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* And that there is no power Eccleſiaſtical or temporal but from the Pope.

13 *vntruth.*

Willet ecl. trad. 544. prel. 3. p. 210.

Caluin 4. inſtit. c. 20. parag. 4. Magiſtratus præditi ſunt diuina authoritate.

Melanthon apud Sur. 1501.

Bel p. 6. Gerſon de poteſt. eccl. confid. 12. p. 3.

4. Behould good Reader Bels euil dealing

XUM

ling with Popes. He chargeth al late Popes with challenging power proper to God, which is a moſt heinous and Luciferian crime, and for proofe therof bringeth not one word, or deede of any one of them, but ones report of ſpeeches of ſome nameles fellows, without prooving that any Pope ether allowed, or liked, yea heard of ſuch ſpeeches. Were ſuch dealing with any priuat man tolerable? And how much les with ſo great Princes as Popes (at leaſt) are. Suppoſe paraſits had attributed to Popes power proper to God, doth it therfore follow that they challeng it? Doe al Princes challeng what their flatterers impoſe vpon them? Did Q. Elizabeth challēg to be a Goddeſſe becauſe Caſe Cambden and other Proteſtants called her a Goddeſſe? *she* (ſaieth Cambden) is *the onely Goddeſſe of Britans. She shalbe my Goddeſſe, the groūd wher she was borne is rather to be adored then adorned. she is Numen to be worshiped of the whole word.* Or doth his Maieſty challeng to be *head of the Church of France*, or Toby Mathew to be the *ornament of learning, and religion*, becauſe Bel ſo tearmeth them? did S. Paul and Barnaby challēg to be Gods, becauſe the Licaonians did ſo account them? doth not the Pope profeſſe him ſelf to be Chriſts Vicar, and ſeruant of his ſeruants? How ſtandeth this with

Proteſtants cal Princes Goddes.

Caſe in ep. ſnop Poli-corum. Cambden in Berqueria, in Natis ad teſtarem. in Cantic. & Epiſt.

Bel in his epiſtles to the King & to B. of Durhom.

Act. 14. v. 10. 11. 12.

with the challeng of equality.

5. But I deny that euer any Catholique attributed to the Pope power proper to God: let vs therfore conſider Gerſons report. The firſt point *is, that Chriſt hath giuen al the power in heauen and earth to S. Peter, and his ſucceſſors which was giuen to himſelf.* But beſide that, theſe words concerne no les the Ancient then the late Popes, namely S. Peter him ſelf, though Bel be aſhamed to charg them with this ſtaunder, are theſe woords of Popish paraſits? doe they giue to men power proper to God alone? Then was S. Chriſoſtome a Popish paraſite, and gaue to Prieſts power proper to God, when he ſaid. *Prieſts haue al power of heauenly things, and the very ſelf ſame al kind of power which Chriſt had of his Father.* S. Baſil ſayth, *that Chriſt gaue this authority to others.* S. Leo writeth *that S. Peter had thoſe things by participation, which Chriſt had proper by power.* or doth Bel think that our King in creating a deputy in Ireland, and giuing him authority to gouerne that Kingdome, giueth him power proper to Kings? Are deputies Kings are they no more ſubiects? True it is that the power which Popes haue, came from God alone as the authority of deputies cometh from Kings, but ſuch power by commiſſion is no more proper to God, then the like

Bels ſlander toucheth as wel S. Peter and the auncient Popes as the late.

S. Chryſoſt. lib. 3. de ſacerdot.

S. Baſil. homil. de penitent. S. Leo ſerm. 2. de Natali Pet. & Pauli.

like in deputies is proper to Kings.

6. The second point in Gersons report is that the forsaid nameles persons cal the Pope *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings*. If these be parasits words and make men equal to God then was Daniel a parasite, & he made Nabuchodonozor equal to God in calling him *King of Kings*. Vnles Bel allow this title in a heathen Prince and account it blasphemy in a Christian. Besyds the Scripture it self doth apply the very names of Christ and God vnto men. And S. Bernard no parasite but a holy writer (in Caluins opinion) calleth the Pope *Prince of Bishops, leader of Christians, hammer of tyrants, father of Kings, Vicar of Christ, Christ of the Lord, and God of Pharao*. And thus spoke S. Bernard euen in those books, where (according to Caluins iudgment) *he spoke it so as truth it selfe semed to speake*. And albeit the Pope do not entitle him selfe King of Kings but *Seruant of Gods seruants*, which is a more humble stile, then any Prince vseth: yet rightly might he, because he hath twoe Kingdomes, vz. Naples and Sicily, Feudatary, and temporally subiect vnto him, as he had also Ireland, before he gaue it vnto the crowne of England in K. Henry 2. time.

Daniel. 2. v. 37.

Exod. 7. psal. 81. Io. 10. psal. 104. Esaiæ 45.

S. Bernard. l. 2. & 4. de cõsiderat.

Caluin. lib. 4. instit. c. 7. paragr. 22.

Caluin. l. 4. c. 11. paragr. 11.

The Pope gaue Irlãd to the King of England. Stovv. ann. 1171.

7. But because Bel is so hard aconstruer of some Catholiques words, let vs heare, not

not a paraſite, but a Proteſtant Prelat, ſpeaking not in abſence but in preſence of the King and realme. Bilſon in his late ſermon at the Kings coronation ſaith *Kings be Gods by office, they haue the ſociety of his name, are in his place, their very robes are ſanctified, euery thing belonging to them is ſacred, are pertakers, with Chriſt in the power, honour, and iuſtice of his Kingdome on earth, and partake with Gods homage*, Behould he calleth Kings Gods, and partners with God in his name, power, honour, and homage, and yet no Catholique chardgeth Proteſtants that they attribute to the King, or that he challengeth power proper to God alone. *Bilſon.*

8. The third point reprehended by Bel in Gerſons reporte, is that eccleſiaſtical and temporal power is ſaid to come from the Pope. *This* (ſaith Bel pag: 16.) *is to make the Pope author of al power, a thing proper to God.* This ſay I is for Bel to vtter two vntruthes at once: for neither do they ſpeake of al power, but only of power in earth, which they deuide into eccleſiaſtical & temporal, beſides which there is power in heauen of God, and Saints: neither do they make the Pope, author of al power in earth, but only ſaie it commeth from the Pope, which is not to make him author therof, vnles Bel wil make euery officer author of what he doth

14. vntruth

15. vntruth.

doth in the Princes name, euery instrument author of the effect it worketh by vertue of the cause. And thus much touching this slaunder of Popes, impoſed by Bel. Now let vs come to others, for no other stuffe we are like to hear hereafter in this article.

Chap. VIII.

Certaine falſe ſteps of a ladder vvhich Bel imagineth the Pope had to climbe to his ſuperiority, diſproued.

Bel pag. 17. BEL hauing vpon the foreſaid words of ſome nameles Catholiques, taken occaſion to ſlaunder Popes, goeth on in like ſorte for many leaues together, ſetting downe ſteppes in a ladder, which (as he imagineth) the Popes had to climbe to their ſuperiority. *The firſt ſteppe* (ſaith he) *was the departure of the Emperour Conſtantine from Rome to Conſtantinople*: but if he had better conſidered, he ſhould haue found that as the cittie of Rome decaied by Conſtantines departure, and Conſtantinople increaſed: So the Sea of Rome rather fel therby in external dignity, and the Sea of Conſtantinople roſe, then otherwiſe. For wheras before Conſtantines going to Conſtantinople (which was about the yeare. 330. that church was but new, and a parish of another

Euſeb. & Hieron. in chron. Conc. Conſtant. epiſt. ad Damaſc. Gelaſ. ad Epiſcop. Dardaniæ.

other church as Gelasius witnesseth, soone after in the yeare 381. it was made a Patriarchate next to Rome, and in the yeare 451. the Grecians gaue it equal priuiledges with Rome. And not content with this, about the yeare 600. that Patriarch arrogated the title of Oecumenical, that is ouer the whole worlde. And finallie in the yeare 1054. claimed the place of the first Patriarch, alleadging the Pope to haue lost his primacy by adding *filióque* to the Nicene Creed.

Cone. Constantin. c. 5. Concil. Calced. act. 16.

Sigebert. in chron.

2. *But Constantine* (sayth Bel) *at his departure did as the Popes parasites tel vs, giue lardge guifts to the Pope, euen his whole power, dominion, and territories, both in Rome, Italy, and al the west.* Behould a man (as the Prouerbe is) hauing a wolfe by the eare, which he dare neither hould nor yet let goe. For if he graunt, that Constantine gaue the Pope his whole power and dominion ouer Rome, Italy, and al the west, he must needs graunt that the Pope of right hath imperial power ouer al the west. If he deny it, he sheweth not how Constātins departure was a steppe for the Pope to climbe to higher authority. Besides that, not Constantins departure, but his guifte should haue bene made the steppe. Notwithstanding choosing rather to condemne him selfe, of not shewing how Constantins departure was a steppe

pag. 7.

for the Pope to climbe, then to graunt that the Pope hath ſo good right to imperial power ouer the weſt, he inclineth to denial of the guift, and citeth Valla, Vlateron, Cathalan & Cuſan fowre late, and obſcure writers againſt it, and tearmeth them Popiſhe paraſites who affirme it.

3. But againſt theſe foure late writers I oppoſe foure moſt auncient, Iſidor, Photius or Balſamon, Gratian, & Iuo, & many late writers, beſides two Iewes Rabby Abraham, and Aben Eſra, who al auouch Conſtantins guift, whereof Photius and the Iewes were profeſſed enimies of the Pope: and Bel him ſelfe confeſſeth that *ſome Emperours haue giuen the Pope their ſouereigne rights.* In which kinde no Emperour excelled Conſtantine. yet *Bellarmine* (ſaith Bel) *ſeemeth to doubt of this, and ſuch like donations.* Wherein Sir? In theſe words (ſaith he) *there are extant at Rome the autentical euidences of theſe and the like donations, and if there were not, preſcription of eight hundred yeares would aboundantlie ſuffice. For Kingdomes vninſtlie gotten are in proces of time made lawful.* as he proueth by the Romane Empier gotten by Ceſar, the Kingdome of England by Saxons, and others. What shew is in theis words of doubt? or rather not of certainty? For Bellarmin affirmeth that the Pope hath

Bellarmin. lib. 5. de Roman. Pont. c. 9.

Preſcription of 30. yeares ſufficeth by ciuil lawe.

two

two iuſt titles to hould his eſtate: The firſt is free guift of Princes, whereof he can ſhew authentical euidences: the other preſcription of time.

4. *The ſecond ſteppe* (ſaith Bel) *Was the fal of the Empire in the Weſt, in the yeare 471. and Vacancy therof for almoſt 330. yeares.* But how this fal and vacancy of the Empire was a ſteppe for Popes to climbe, neither he sheweth nor any can imagin, eſpecially if (as he writeth ſtraight after) *in this Vacancie of the Empire Rome was ſpoiled With fier & ſword, and the Verie Walles throwne downe to the ground, and al Italie poſſeſſed of the Barbares Vntil Carolus Magnus*, who was the firſt Emperour after the vacancie, if in this vacancy Rome was deſtroied, and al Italy poſſeſſed by Barbares (who for the moſt part were heathens, or heretiks) how could it bee a ſteppe for the Pope to climbe, and not rather to fal? pag. 3.

5. Euident it is out of hiſtories of thoſe times, that Popes in that vacancy were ſometime vnder Barbares, ſometime vnder Emperours of the Eaſt, according as the one preuailed againſt the other (for falſe it is that Barbares poſſeſſed al Italy vntil Carolus Magnus yea Bel before ſaid that *Popes liued Vnder Emperours Vntil the yeare 603.*) and betwixt both liued in great daunger, ſubie- pag. 2. 3.

Siluerius. Iohannes 1. Martinus 1. Leo 3. Sergius. Gregorius 2. vid. Platinam in vit. Pont.

ction, and misery. Three of them died in banishment or prison, one pitifullie mangled and beaten, others should haue bene imprisoned and murdered, and diuers were straictlie besieged of their enimies. And for a long time none could be freelie elected without consent of the Barbares, or Emperours. And can we thinke that this was a time for Popes to climbe to greater authority? I omit, that before Bel said *Popes liued in ductiful obedience vnder Emperours vntil the yeare 603.* how doth he now saie that they climbe to tiranny from the yeare 471.

5. Contradict.

pag. 8. 9.

6. *The 3. steppe* (saith Bel) *vvas the voluntarie Charter vvhich Constantin the Emperour of Constantinople made to Pope Benedict. 2. vz. that vvhosoeuer the Cleargie people and Romane souldires should choose to be Bishoppe, al men should beleeue him to be the true Vicar of Christ, vvithout any tarying for any authority of the Emperour of Constantinople, or the deputy of Italie, as the custome and manner vvas euer before that day.* Thus (saith he) writeth Platina. *And the Popes almost for the space of 700. yeares could haue no iurisdiction, nor be reputed true Bishoppes of Rome, vvithout the letter pattēts of the Emperour.*

16 vntruth

Platina in Benedict. 2.

Vbicunque est impudentia ibi est vitio. Chrisost. hom. 4. in illud Esai. vidi Dominū.

7. Behould the impudencie of this fellow. Platina saith, *vt antea fieri consueuerat*, Bel affirmeth him to say, *it vvas the custome*

euer

euer before that daie. where is in Platina the worde (*euer*) where (*til that daie*) Nay doth not Platina saie that Pelagius the second was created *iniussu principis* without commaund of the Prince, that Siluerius was made Pope *iubente Theodohato* at the commaund of Theodate a Gothishe King? Did not Bel him selfe tel vs that *Barbarians ruled in Rome, and possessed al Italie for 330. yeares, vntil Charles the great*? How then could it be, that before Benet the second neuer Popes could haue iurisdiction, and be accompted true Bishops of Rome without letter patents of Emperours, who were professed enimies, and made warre vpon most of these Barbarians? or is Bel so mad euen to imagine, that Pope Anaclete (to omit S. Peters want of Neroes letter patents) could haue no iurisdiction, or be reputed true Bishoppe of Rome, without letter parents of Domitian the Emperour, Clement without Traianus? Cornelius without Decius? Caius without Diocletian? or the other holie Popes that were martyred vnder heathen Emperours, without their letter parents?

Platin. in pelagio & in Siluerio. Nauclerus general. 18. Bland. Dec. 1. l. 3.

pag. 8.

8. What therefore Platina saieth had bene wont to be done before, about expecting the confirmation of the Emperour, or his deputie in Italy, he vnderstood of the time since Pope Vigilius, (excepting Pela-

gius 2.) vntil Benedict the second; for Iustinian the Emperour hauing in the yeare 553. quite subdued the Gothes, and recouered Rome and Italie, which had bene lost to the Barbares in the yeare 475. or 476. (Bel pag. 8. wronglie saith 471.) imitating the tiranny of the Gothish Kings, who being Arians much oppressed the Popes, appointed that they after their election, should expect the Emperour or his deputies confirmation, before they were consecrated, or vsed their function. And this order endured from Pope Vigilius his time, vntil Benedicte the second, for more then one hundred years, at what time Constantine the fifth, in the Platin. sup. yeare 684 moued (saie the writers) at the holines of Benedicte 2. abrogated the said order, permitting as wel the consecration, as the election of Popes vnto the Romane Cleargie, and people.

9. Hereby wee see, that the creation of Popes without Emperours consent, was no new thing begun first in Benedict. 2. but an auncient libertie begun euen with the Popedome it selfe, and continued vnder Constantine the great and other Christian Emperours vntil the time of the barbarous Gothish Kings, & restored againe by Constantine the fifth. but marke good reader how Bel before confessed Gregory the great

Papistry a-bone a thowsand years ould yet newe with Bel. pag. 2.

who

(who died about the yeare 604) to haue bene a Papist, and here acknowledgeth the Emperour Phocas in the yeare 607. to haue declared Rome to be the head of al Churches: likewise Constantine the fifth in the yeare 984. to haue declared the Pope to bee Christs true vicar: yet neuertheles wil haue Papistrie, and Popes supremacie to be new things. So to him a thowsand yeares are as one daie.

The same declared Iustinian about the year 532. epist. ad Ioã. P. and Valentinian ep. ad Theodosium lõg before. pag. 83. 2. Pet. 3. v. 8.

10. The fourth steppe Bel maketh the deposition of Childrick King of France by Pope Zacharie, which (he saith) the Pope did for hope of aduauncemẽt. But as for the deposition, it was most iust, for it was done, not only with the consent of the whole realme of France, no man reclaiming, but at their request as testifieth Sabellius æneid 8. & Blandus Dec: 1. lib: 10. out of Alcuin: Paule and others, at what time the Sarazins possessing al Egipt, Siria, Affrick, & Spaine, had not long before inuaded France, with many hundred thousands of men, & Childrick being extreamlie slouthful, & careles of the commonwealth, not only France, but al Christendome was in great daunger to be ouerrunne with those Sarazins.

This Childrick vvas surnamed the Idiot or sensles. Claud. Paradin. Annal. Frãc. Naucler. general. 25. Platin. in Gregor. 3.

11. And that Pope Zacharies intention was iuste, appeareth by his great holines of life, who (as Anastasius and others write)

was ſo good as he would not requite euil with euil, and much leſſe for his owne aduauncement wrongfullie depoſe a King, as Bel vpon meare malice, without al proofe doth calumniate him, taking vpon him to know *the ſecrets of harts,* and *Iudge an others ſeruant.*

2. Paralip. 6.

Besides, that neither was he any way aduaunced by Pipin, nor can it be iuſtlie preſumed, that he expected to be. But for what end ſoeuer it had bene done, it could be no ſteppe to the Popes ſuperiority ouer Princes, but an act of ſuch authority already gotten.

Roman. 14.

Bellarm. lib. 5. de Rom. Pontif. c. 8.

11. Whereupon Bellarmin out of this ſo auncient example, aboue eight hundred yeares agoe, proueth Popes to haue ſuch authority, whereat Bel ſo ſtormeth that he ſaith. *Ieſuits teach that the Pope can ſet vp, and pul downe Kings at his pleaſure, and that they are grand maiſters, and Architects of ſeditions, rebellious, and bloudie treaſons,* which are but falſe ſlaunders of his owne. *Et quis innocens erit ſi accuſaſſe ſufficiat.* And aduiſeth Chriſtian Princes that *if the Pope ſend any into their dominions, vvith his Buls and excommunications, they deale vvith them as Phillip the faire dealt vvith Boniface the eights Nuncio, vvhom he impriſoned, and burned their buls: and as Charles the ſixt, vvho gaue ſentence that the buls of Benedic. 13. ſhould be rent in pieces, the bearer ſet on the pillarie, and traduced in the*

pag 10. 17 vntruth 18 vntruth

pag. 11.

in the pulpit. But withal he forgot to tel what befel to Phillip for his euil dealing with Boniface, vz. That he him selfe was killed with a fal of his horse, his three sonnes vntimelie died, their wiues shamefullie taken in adultery, and the crowne translated from his Issue to an other line. Of Benedic 13. no meruaile if he and his messenger were so handled, because he was no true, but a falfe Pope; and thus much of Bels first oure steppes, now let vs se the rest.

Geneirard. in chron. Antonin. 3. part. art. 20. paragr. 20.

Chap. IX.

The rest of Bels false steps, and slaunderous vntruths in this article disproued.

Bel pag. 11.

The *first steppe* (saith Bel) *was the decaie of the Empire in the East about the yeare 756, at what time Pipin being called into Italie by Pope Steeuen 2 to deliuer Rome from the siedge of Lombards, and ouercomming them gaue vp the gouernement of Italie into the Popes handes.* Here Bel hudleth vp store of vntruths. *That the empire decaied in the East about the yeare 756.* For it decaied long before about the yeare 635. vnder the heretical Emperour Heraclius, when the Sarazens conquered Palestin, Siria, and Egipt, and about the yeare 697. al Affrick, & went more & more decaying according as it reuolted from the faith and obedience of the

19 vntruth

Onuphr. in chron. Platin. in Honorio 1. art. 623. Balmerin. in chron. 639. Onuphr. in chron.

of the Romane Sea, vntil in the yeare 1452. it was vtterly extinguished, Constantinople being taken by Turks, and the Emperour slaine. And about 756. wherof Bel speaketh, the Easterne Empire lost litle or nothing, except a verie smal piece of Italie, called the exarchate which the Lombards had conquered in the yeare 751.

2. *That Pipin gaue vp Italy into the Popes hands.* Whereas Pipin subdued only that part of Italie which the Lombards held: *that in Pipins conqueſt ended the vvhole povver of the Emperours Lieutenants in Italy.* This is doubly vntrue. First because Pipin conquered nothing from the Emperour but from the Lombards, who foure or fiue years before, had taken the exarchate of Reuenna from the Empire. Secondly because, besides that which Pipin then conquered, or the Lombards had before taken from the Empire, the Emperours had both then, and long after great dominion in Italy, vz almost al the kingedome of Naples which he gouerned by Lieutenants.

21 vntruth.

Naucler. general. 27. Platin. in Leone 3. Bland. Dec. 2. lib. 1.

1. But what was the end of this vntruth? forsooth that we should Imagine, that in Pipins time the Pope became Antechriſt. For *novv* (saith Bel, *vvas he taken avvay, vvho as the Apoſtle teacheth vs hindred the comming of Antechriſt*, meaninge the Emperours dominion

pag. 12. 2. Thess. 2.

minion in Italie. Marke good reader in the yeare 476. or as Bel ſaith 471. not only al Italie, was taken from the Emperour, by the Herules, but he alſo depoſed, and the weaſterne Empire vtterlie diſſolued. And albeit in the yeare 553. the Grecian Emperours recouered Italy againe, yet ſoone after in the yeare 568. they loſt a great parte therof to the Lombards, which they neuer recouered. And in neither of theſe times Bel thinketh the hinderance of Antichriſts comming, whereof S. Paul ſpake, to haue bene taken away, becauſe then he findeth no coulour to make the Pope a new Antechriſt.

Baron. annal. Onuphr. in chron.

Onuphr. in chron. Palmer. in chron. 572.

4 But when the Grecian Emperours loſt to the Lõbards the exarchate of Reuenna (a petit dominion of fiue Cities, & one ſhire called Emilia, though they helde ſtil a good part of Italie) then the hindrance of Antechriſte was taken away, becauſe forſooth ſoone after, that exarchate being taken by Pipin from the Lombards, it was by him giuen to the Pope, who therby became Antechriſt. as if Bishops become Antechriſts by temporal liuings. a reaſon ſmelling ranckely of a puritan ſpirit, which would pul downe Bishopricks; but if temporal dominion made the Pope Antechriſt, he was long before Pipin: for in the yeare

Naucler. general. 26.

699.

699. Aripert King of Lombardy gaue to him the Coctian Alpes where Geneua is, which donation confirmed King Luithprand in the yeare 714. as the Magdeburgians confesse. and King Pipin in the yeare 755. added the exarchate, and a good piece of Italy which he had conquered from the Lombards.

Ado in chronic. Bland. Dec. 1. lib. 10. Magdeburg. cent. 8. c. 10. Regino Ado Sigebert. in chron. Magdeburg. supra.

5. As for the hindrance of Antechrists comming whereof S. Paule speaketh, it was not the petit dominion which the Emperours had in the exarchate of Reuenna, but the Romane Empire it selfe; as testifie S. Chrisostome, and others vpon that place, S. Ciril Catech. 15. S. Hierom q. 11. ad Algasiam: S. Augustin lib. 20. de ciuit. c. 19. and other fathers who out of that place affirme, that Antechrist shal not come vntil the Romane Empire be quite taken away, which is not yet. I let passe a contradiction of Bel saying, p. 8. *that Barbarians possessed al Italy vnto Carolus Magnus*, and pag. 11. *that in Pipins time whoe was Carolus his father ended the power of the Emperours Lieutenants* in Italy. For how could the Emperours haue Lieutenants in Italy vntil Pipin, if Barbarians possessed al Italy vnto his sonnes time.

S. Chrisost. S. Ciril. S. Hierom. S. August. tom. 5.

Contradict.

6. But the quicke sight of this fellowe, whoe before called so many Kings & Emperours blinde, I can not let passe. He writeth

teth (pag. 11.) that *Pipin gaue vppe the gouernment of Italy into the Popes hands, a thing* (saith he) *so apparant as it can not be denied*, and yet (pag. 14.) confesseth, *that he can not see how the Pope was King in Pipins time.* So blinde he is that he can not see, that to giue vp the gouernment of a Kingdome into ones hands, is to make him King. Againe he can not see, *how if Pipin as Sigebert writeth had Italie in his possession in the yeare 801. and Bernard made King thereof by Carolus Magnus 812. that the Pope was either then or now any King at al.* Surelie Bel is either short sighted or starcke blinde. For what Sigebert writeth of Pipin, he meaneth not of Pipin Carolus his father and giuer of the exarchate, who died 768. but of Pipin Carolus his sonne: and neither his possessing Italy 801. nor his sonne Bernards kingdome therof 812. doth preiudice the Popes regality ouer the exarchate and Cottian Alpes, giuen him before by King Pipin & Aripert, any more then it doth preiudice the regality and dominion which the greeke Emperours had at the same time ouer a great parte of Italie, vz. From Naples and Manfredonia to the sea of Sicily.

pag. 14. *His brother willet controuers. 4. q. 10. p. 7. pag. 178. saith that the imperial authority is in the Pope.* Naucler. general. 26. Palmerius in chronic. *Paradin des alliances Genealogiques.* Naucler. general. 27. Platina in Leone 3. Eland. Dec. 1. l. 1.

7. For besides that Lombardy (whereof Pipin and Bernard were kings) was then called Italie, as is euident out of Charles his testament, where he saith. *Italie which is also called* Naucler. general. 28.

called Lombardy, becauſe they alone in Italy were then called Kings, and poſſeſſed the beſt parte thereof, they were intitled of the whole: as the Kings of England were before the vnion of Scotland by ſtraungers called in latin Kings of Britanny. And as for Charles the great, he was ſoe far from taking from the Pope, what his father Pipin had giuen, as he added thereto (ſaith Nauclerus) *the ile of Corſica, and what is from Luna to the Alpes confines of Italy, and what betwixt Parma and Luca, together with the Dukedomes of Spoleto and Beneuent.*

Leo Oſtienſis lib. 1. chron. Caſſinen.

8. But yet far greater blindenes it is, not to be able to ſee how the Pope can be now any Kinge at al, if others were Kings of Italie 800. years agoe, can he not ſe how kingdomes may be altered not only to different families, but euen to diuers nations in leſſe then eight hindred years? are not the Normans and their diſcent Kings of England becauſe they were not 800. nay 600: years agoe? are not Spaniards Kings in Italie, becauſe they were not 400. yeares agoe? could not the Popes in eight hundred years ſpace come to a kingdome either by guifte of Princes or by iuſt ware, or at leaſt by preſcription of time, which they had not before.

9. As for the Popes beſides the guifts of Con-

Conſtantine, Ariſthpert, Pipin, and Carolus Magnus before mentioned, Ludouic: Pius Emperour and ſonne to Carolus Magnus confirmed the donation of his grandfather Pipin, and afterward Counteſſe Maud, gaue to the Pope Liguria and Tuſcia in the yeare 1079. of which guifts the authentical euidences (ſaith Bellarmin) are extant in Rome. Which ſuffiſeth to let Bel ſee how the Pope may be now a King, though he were none in the yeare 812. beſides that (pag: 17.) he could ſee *how ſome Chriſtian Kings and Emperours haue yeelded vp their ſouereigne rights to the Pope*, and (pag. 11.) how *Pipin gaue vp the gouernment of Italie into his hand*, and is he ſtricken blinde in the mideſt, ſo that (pag: 14.) he could not ſee *how the Pope is now any King at al.* Thus much of Bels blindnes out of his owne confeſſion. Now let vs ſee as much of his ſmal credit by the like confeſſion.

Gratian. d. 63. can. ego Ludouicus.

Leo lib. 3. chron. c. 48.

Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. c. 3.

10. *Bellarmin* (ſaith he) *muſt be credited at leiſure, when he telleth vs that Pipin gaue Rauenna, and Pentapolis to S. Peter & S. Paul*, meaning the Pope, and yet him ſelfe telleth vs (pag: 11.) *that Pipin gaue vp the gouernement of Italie into the Popes hands.* If Bellarmin muſt be credited at leiſure, for ſaying Pipin gaue to the Pope a ſmal parte of Italie, though he proue it by many witneſſes, and Bel confeſſe it *to be ſo*

Bel pag. 14. Bellar. ſup.

Ex Adone loc. cit. & l. 3. c. 3. ex regione & Sigebert. in chron. Bland. Dec. 1. lib. 10. Magdeburg. cent. 8. c. 10.

Bel p. 12. Bel not to be credited.

be so apparant that it can not be denied. Surelie him selfe must not be credited at al, for saying without al testimony, yea contrary to his owne testimony (pag: 13.) *that he gaue Italie to the Pope.* I omit a petit vntruth of his saying that Meroueus was the first christian King of France. So blinde he is that he can not discerne the grand-father from the grand-childe, Meroueus from Clodoueus, a heathen from a christian.

Annal. Gall. Claude Paradin des Alliances Gnealogiques.

Bel pag. 12.

11. The sixt steppe, Bel maketh the translation of the Empire by Pope Leo 3. from the Greekes to the French, or Germans in the person of Charles the great, of this translation we haue spoken before, and it is rather a notorious act of the Popes superiority ouer Emperours, then a steppe thereunto. But because Sigebert in recounting it saith *Romani animo desciuerant ab Imperatore Constantinopoli.* Which Bel Englisheth reuolted from the Emperour, he inferreth diuers vntruths: first *that Popes were subiect to Emperours 800. yeares after Christ.* Secondly *that the translation of the Empire implied flat treason in the Pope, and Romans.* Thirdlie *that Sigebert saith they surrendered the right of their soueraigne to an other.*

Sigeb. chronic. 801.

pag. 13.

23 vntruth.

24 vntruth

25 vntruth.

Bel disproued by him selfe.

12. To disproue the two first vntruths I need no other witnes then Bel him selfe, who (pag: 8.) affirmed that *from the yeare*

471.

471. vntil *Carolus Magnus* (which was 801.) *Barbarians poſſeſſed al Italie.* If from 471. vntil 801. Barbarians poſſeſſed al Italie, how were Popes 800. yeares vnder Emperours? how committed they treaſon againſt Emperours, in making Carolus Emperour, if at that time, & aboue 300. yeares before, they were not vnder Emperours, but vnder Barbarians. *Contradict.* 7. *Contradict.* 8.

13. The truth is that Barbarians poſſeſſed Italie from the yeare 476. for more then 80. yeares, after which time the Grecian Emperour in the yeare 553. recouered al Italie, and albeit they loſt shortly after in the yeare 568. a great part therof, yet they kept Rome vntil about the yeare 726. Onuph ſaith 731, when both Rome and Italie reuolted from Leo 3. Emperour of Conſtantinople for his hereſie againſt Images, and would then haue choſen an other Emperour againſt him, if Gregory the ſecond then Pope had not diſſwaded them. Since which time Rome was neuer vnder the Emperours of Conſtantinople. And therefore neither were the Popes ſubiect to Emperours 800. yeares after Chriſt: nor did Pope Leo commit any treaſon againſt the Grecian Emperors, by creating Charles Emperour in the yeare 801. which was almoſt a hundred yeares after the reuolt of Baron. in annal. Onuphr. in chron. Baron. in annal.

Italy from the greekes. As for the third vntruth it is euident, becauſe Sigebert doth not cal the grecian Emperour ſoueraigne to to the Romans: And the word *deſciuerant* ſignifieth any forſaking or leauing of one, whether he be his ſoueraigne or no.

Bel pag. 13. 14. But Bel goeth on in erring the Pope not to be true King of Italie, becauſe writers agree not about the Pope to whom, or time, when this regality was firſt graunted. Marke good reader, him ſelfe before affirmed that *King Pipin gaue vp the gouernement of Italie into Pope Steeuens hands and that this truth is apparant by the teſtemony of many renowmed Cronographes, and can not be denied,* and now in the next page denieth both the fact, and conteſtation of hiſtoriographers. What wil he not deny, who denieth that which him ſelfe ſaith can not be denied?

pag. 12. 13.

Bel denieth what him ſelfe ſaith cannot be denied.

Onuphr. in chron. Naucleru general. 25. An. 750. Claudius Parad. *des alliances Genealogiques.* Ado Regino Sigebert. in chron. Blond. Dec. 1 l. 10. Magdeburgenſ. cent. 8. c. 10. Leo Oſtien. lib. 1. chron. c. 9. Onuph. ſup.

15. The truth is that Pipin gaue not the exarchate to Greg. 3 who died in the yeare 741 or as other write 740, fourteene yeares before Pipins entrance into Italie, neither was Pipin then a King, but made afterward by Zachary ſucceſſor to Gregory as Bel teſtifieth page 19. but to Pope Steeuen 2. as is apparant (to vſe Bels words) by the teſtimony of many renowmed Cronographers, though ſome cal him Steeuen 3. becauſe they reckon his predeceſſour, whom others omit,

omit, becauſe he liued but foure daies, likewiſe al writers agree that Lewes pius confirmed the donation of his grandfather Pipin vnto Paſchal. 1. and his name is in the donation, as alſo that Counteſſe Maud gaue Liguria, and Tuſcia vnto Gregory the ſeauenth.

Apud Gratian. diſt. 63. can. ego Ludouicus. Leo Oſtien. lib. 3. chron. c. 48.

16. And Bels prouing the hiſtoriographers to diſagree, becauſe Blondus and Platina (ſaith he) write that Pipin gaue the exarchate to Gregory the third, Regino referreth it to Steeuen, and Sigebert ſaith Pipin had Italy in his owne poſſeſſion in the yeare 801. is like the reſt of his proceedings. For that of Platina is a manifeſt vntruth, for he ſaith Pipin gaue the exarchate in Pope Steeuen the ſecond his time, and Sigebert meaneth not of King Pipin the giuer of the exarchate who died 768, but of his grandchild ſonne to Carolus Magnus, and how his poſſeſſion of Italy doth not preiudicate the Pope, is before explicated. Regino ſaith that which is truth, for beſt authors agree, that Pipin gaue the exarchate in the yeare 755. at what time Steeuen 2. al. 3. was Pope.

Bel pag. 13.

Platina in Stephan. 2. Naucler. general. 26. Palmerius in chronic. Claud. Paradi. in Pepin. paragr. 6. 7. 8. 9.

17. But ſuppoſe writers did not agree about the Pope to whome, and time, when Pipin made his guift of the exarchate, muſt we therefore needs deny the guift in which they al agree? So wee

might deny that Christ was borne, because writers agree not about the time: is it not vsual for historiographers to agree in the substance of the narration, and yet differ in some circumstance of the person, or time?

18. Last of al least we should thinke the Grecian Emperors, acknowledged Charles made by the Pope to be true Emperour, he telleth vs out of Sigebert, that they had indignation against Charles, and therefore he with often Embassages procured their friendshipes: yea *Blondus and Platina* (saith he) *affirme constantlie that Charles agreed with Irene, and afterward with Nicephoras, that with their fauors he might rule ouer the West.* Behould the drift of Bel, to make vs thinke that Charles became Emperour, not by creation of the Pope, but by graunt of Grecian Emperors: so loath he is to confesse the Pope had so great authority aboue 800. years agoe. Wherein the silly foole ouerthroweth what he before said. For if the Pope did not translate the Empire, then was it no steppe to his tiranny, as he imagineth.

Bel pag. 14. Sigebert. An. 805.

19. But let vs heare how he proueth, that the Grecian Emperours did not acknowledge Charles the great for true Emperour, first forsooth *because Sigebert saith, they had indignation against Charles*; what then? are ne-

are neuer Emperours offended for any thing lawfullie done, eſpeciallie if they thinke it preiudice their eſtate & dignity? and albeit Sigebert affirme, that ſome Grecian Emperours (who them ſelues came vnlawfullie and by tiranny to the Empire, and that after Charles was crowned Emperour) had indignation againſt Charles; yet none write that Irene (who was the only & lawful Empreſſe at that time, when Charles was created) was offended with his creation, but rather content, as may be gathered by hir purpoſe which (as Zonoras and Cedrenus write) she had to marry him, Yea Nauclerus ſaith, ſhe was depoſed for the fauor ſhe bore to Charles, beſides the indignation of thoſe Emperours vz. Nicephorus, Michael, and Leo, was not ſo much for the Imperial dignity taken by Charles, as becauſe, as writeth Eginhart, Charles his ſecretary, *they greatlie ſuſpected leaſt he ſhould take the Empire from them*; which they might iuſtlie feare, becauſe by tirany and depoſition of their predeceſſors, they had gotten it, and yet notwithſtanding their indignation, of their owne accord they ſent Embaſſadours to Charles, and made league and friendshippe with him, as the ſame Eginhart, Ado, and others teſtifie. Yea the Magdeburgians adde, that the *Grecians in a*

Naucler. generall. 28.

Eginhart in vita Caroli.

manner consented to Charles his Empire.

Platina in Leone 3.

20. His other proofe out of Platina containeth an vntruth, for Platina writeth that Charles being made Emperour, Irene sent Embassadours to make peace and league with him, & to deuide Italie betwixt them, which league Nicephorus renued: but he hath no word of Charles his ruling the west with their fauours, more then of their ruling the East with his. And the like saith Blondus.

Blond. Dec. 2. l. 1.

Bel pag. 14.

21. *The seauenth steppe* (saith Bel) *was the constitution of the seauen Princes electors of the future Emperour by Pope Gregory 5. by the fauour and free graunt of Otho then Emperour.* But this was rather an act of superiority in the Pope ouer Emperours, then a steppe vntil it. And seing this constitution hath euer since bene inuiolablie obserued, and the Emperours so elected accompted as true Emperours throughout al Christendome, a signe it is that Christians thinke the Pope hath authority to appoint Electors, who may choose what Emperour they please, by the authority giuen them from the Pope. Wherfore I would Bel answered me this dilemma. The seauen Electors haue authority to choose an Emperour, or not? If they haue then the Pope who gaue them that authority, had the same, because none can giue what

what he hath not him ſelfe; if not, Bel depoſeth at once more Emperours and Princes, then al Popes haue done.

22. *The eight and higheſt ſteppe of this ladder* (ſaith Bel) *did reach vp euen to the higheſt heauen, and to the verie throne of our lord Ieſus.* here is a great cry! now let vs ſee *quid dignum tanto fert hic promiſſor hiatu?* *becauſe* (ſaith he) *they challenge the royal right of both ſwords throughout the Chriſtian world, and haue made thereof a flat decree.* But firſt I deny that the Pope, as Pope, challengeth royal right of either ſword. For his right to the ſpiritual ſword is not royal, but of a different nature, as is euident, & shal be declared hereafter: and his royal right to the material ſword, is neither ouer al chriſtendome, as Bel vntruelie auoucheth, but only ouer the Popedome: nor he challendgeth it by his Papacie, yea (as Pope Gelaſius wrote) *Popes haue not challendged royal ſouereaignтie*, but by the guiſte of Princes, who as Bel ſaith haue giuen their rights to them. And albeit the decree doe (after S. Bernard) giue to the Pope right of the material ſword; yet neither hath it the word *royal*, nor meaneth of Royal right, as is euident becauſe it teacheth, that this ſword is not to be drawne, or vſed by the Popes hand (as no doubt it might, if he had royal right vnto it) but

Bel pag. 13.

Extrauag. Bonif. 8. vnam ſanctam de maioritate & obedientia. *vntruth.*

Gelaſius de vinculi. anathematis. & Nicol. 1. dec. 96. can. cum ad verum. *pag. 17.* Bernard. lib. 4. de conſideratione.

by the hand of the ſouldier, at the commaundement of the Emperour, and becke of the Pope. Whereby we ſee, that the decree attributeth royal right, of the material ſword, only to the Emperour, who is to commaund the ſouldier to draw, and vſe it, and to the Pope only authority to direct the Emperour in his commaund and vſe of his ſword.

23. But ſuppoſe that Popes did challenge royal right of both ſwrods, throughout the chirſtian world, is this to climbe to the higheſt heauen and to Chriſtes throne? doth the chriſtian world reach to the higheſt heauen? or yet to the bounds of the earth? doth Chriſtes throne rule no more then the chriſtian worlde? or doth royal authority vnder him, reach to his throne? ſurelie Bel hath a baſe conceipt of Chriſtes kingdome, if he imagine that Popes, or Princes by their authorities, reach to his throne, who (as S. Paul ſaith) *is aboue al powers and princedomes, thrones and dominations, and aboue euerie name which is named, either in this world or in the next.* but marke good reader, how Bel condemneth thar for horrible blaſphemie in the Pope, which him ſelfe accoumpteth as highe treaſon to deny to other Princes. For what is ſupremacie in both eccleſiaſtical & ciuil cauſes, but (as he ſpeaketh) royal right

Ad Epheſ. c.1.v 21.

Bel condemneth that in the Pope for blaſphemie, which he iudgeth treaſon to deny to Princes.

right of both swords, and to deny this to temporal Princes, he deemeth no lesse then highe treason.

24. Secondlie he proueth his foresaid slaunder out of Pope Nicholas 1. his words, *Christ committed to S. Peter the right both of heauenlie and earthlie empire.* which Bel seemeth to vnderstand of spiritual, and temporal power. *Answer.* Suppose the words were meant of spiritual & temporal power, they make nothing for royal right, but may be wel expounded according to the meanig of the foresaid decree. That S. Peter had from Christ right to both empires, vz. to gouerne the one, and to direct the other, but of royal right there is no word in P: Nicholas: yea he professeth *that Christ distinguished eclesiastical and imperial* power by distinct acts and dignities, that in spiritual matters the Emperour should need Bishops, & in temporal, Bishops vse Emperourrs. But indeed Pope Nicholas meaneth not of temporal power at al, but only of spiritual giuen to S. Peter, Which he calleth both earthlie and heauenlie dominion, because according to our Sauiours words (Math: 16. to which he alludeth what he looseth in earth is loosed in heauen.

pag. 14. Dist. 22. can. omnes.

Nicol. 1. ep. ad Michael. Imper.

25. I omit a glose cited by Bel, because it only saith that the Pope hath both swords, vz, in

Glossa F. Celestia.

vz, in the sense before explicated. But what he bringeth out of an obscure appendix of P. Boniface his making a constitution, wherein he affirmed him selfe to be spiritual and temporal Lorde in the whole worlde, is vntrue, as is euident by the constitution, and words before cited out of it.

Appendix Fuldensis.

Clemens 5. And Pope Clement 5. declared extrauag. *meruit Charissimi: de priuilegys*: that Pope Boniface his constitution did nothing preiudice the kingdome of France. But what the appendix saith of Boniface his sending to Phillip King of France to haue him acknowledge, he helde the kingdome of him, may wel be expounded by that Platina writeth vz. *That Phillip hauing against the law of nations imprisoned a Bishop, whom Boniface sent vnto him to perswade him to make ware against Infidels, the Pope sent the Archedeacon of Narbo to procure the Bishops libertie, and otherwise to denounce, that the kingdome of France was fallen to the churches dispositon, for the offence of the Kinge.*

Platin. in Bonifac. 8.

Bel pag. 16. 26. But let vs goe on with Bel. *Since this ladder* (saith he) *was thus framed. Popes haue tiranized aboue measure, deposed Kings and Kingdomes, and taken vpon them authority, pertaining to God alone.* Omitting Bels straunge phrase of deposing Kingdomes: if to depose Kings for neuer so iust cause be to tiranize,

tiranize, Protestants haue tiranized far more in the space of 70. years, then the Pope hath in these 300. years since that decree was made. For in al these 300. yeares, besids one or two Kings of Naples, who were his liege men, I finde deposed by the Pope one Schismatical and heretical Emperour of Greece Andronicus Paleologus, and one other doubtful Emperour Ludouick the Bauarian, two French Kings Philip. 4. and Ludouick 12. and one King of Bemeland George, and one King of Nauarre, besides King Henry 8. and Queene Elizabeth, and these al for heynous crimes. whereas Protestants in 70. years (setting aside the iniustice of their quarrel) haue as much as laie them, deposed one Emperour, six or seauen Kings, & two absolute Queenes, slaine two Kings, one Queene, and one Queenes husband, as before hath bene tolde. c. 4. paragr. 6.

How many deposed by Popes in 300. years. Clemens 5. extrauag. ad Certitudinem.

How many by Protestants in 70. years.

27. And Bel who so much obserueth the deposition of Emperours and Kings by the Pope, and omitteth both their iniuries to him, and his benefits done to them, sheweth him selfe to be no indifferent man. For omitting almost 33. Popes put to death by heathen Emperours, Christian Emperours, Princes, and others, haue murdered six Popes vz. *Felix* 2. *Iohannes* 11. *Iohannes* 15. *Benedi-*

Sacerdotes nunquam tyranni fuerunt, sed tyrannos sæpe sunt passi: Amb. ep. 33.

vid. Platinam in vit. Pont.

Six Popes murdered.

Benedictus 6. *Clement.* 2. *Victor* 3. beſides *Gregory* 2. and diuers other whome they haue attempted to murder. They haue banished foure vz. *Liberius, Sienerius, Vigilius, Martin* 1, beſides many others whom for feare of their liues they droue into banishment. they haue impriſoned ſix vz. *Iohannes* 1. *Iohannes* 9. *Paſchorlis* 2. *Boniface* 8. *Vrbanus* 6. *Clement.* 7. beſyd *Sergius* 1. & others whom they attempted to impriſon. They haue depoſed as much as they could ſixteene vz. *Iohannes* 12. *al.* 13. *Benedict.* 5: *Gregory* 5. *Benedict.* 8. *and* 9. *Alexander* 2. *Gregory* 6. *and* 7. *Gelaſius* 2. *Innocent.* 2. *Alexander* 3. *Iohn* 22. *Vrban* 6. *Martin* 5. by *Alphons* King of Attragon, *Eugen.* 4. by procurement of *Philip* Duke of Millen & *Iulius* 2. whereas on the contrary ſide (to omit ſpiritual benefits) Popes haue beſtowed the Empire vpon almoſt al them Emperours whom they depoſed, and haue refuſed to take the Empire from the Germans though they haue bene much ſollicited thereto by the Grecians, and to let paſſe their liberality to other Princes, they haue beſtowed the Kingdome of *Ireland* vpon Henry the ſecond, and of Naples and Sicily vpon *Henry* 3. and the moſt honourable title *of defender of the faith* vpon *Henry* 8. Kings of England: hereby may the indifferent reader (euen ſetting aſide

Foure baptubed.

Six empriſoned.

Sixteene deposed.

Platin. in Alexand. 3. *Liberality of Popes towards England.* Stovve an. 1171. Polidorus lib. 16. Comin. venaura in relation. de Napoli.

When would Luther and Caluin haue giuen three Kingdomes to England.

aside the iuſtice of the cauſe, and conſidering only the fact) clearly perceaue, whether Chriſtian Emperours and Princes haue more tiranized ouer Popes, then Popes ouer them, now let vs come to Bels proofe of his ould ſlaunder here againe renued, of the Popes taking vpon them power proper to God alone.

28. *A Gloſſe* (ſaith he) *affirmeth the Pope to haue celeſtial arbitrement, to be able to alter the nature of things, applying the ſubſtance of one to an other, and to make ſomething of nothing: and the Pope* (ſaith Bel) *is wel pleaſed therewith.* *Anſwer.* As for the Pope being pleaſed with the foreſaid words, it is more then Bel knoweth, but ſure I am he deteſteth them, if they be meant of power to create, or proper to God alone. But wel I ſee that which doth not diſpleaſe Bel, if it be giuen to Princes; he condemneth as intolerable blaſphemie, if it be attributed to Popes. For the foreſaid words are al in the ciuil lawe, and by the Emperours applied either to them ſelues, or to the Pope: as the Emperours *Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodoſius de ſum. Trin. lib.* 1. affirme the Popes to haue celeſtial arbitrement, and condemne them as infamous hereticks, who follow not the religion of Pope Damaſus: and his arbitrement in ſpiritual matters, may be called heauen-

Bel pag. 14. Gloſſ. lib. 2. tit. 7. c. 3.

Three Emperours ſay the P. hath celeſtial arbitrement.

heauenlie, becauſe his authority therein came from heauen. That of altering the nature of things, and applying the ſubſtance of one to an other, the Emperour Iuſtinian *C. communia de leg. lib. 2.* applieth to him ſelfe and meaneth of ciuil contracts, as legacis and feoffees in truſt, which by his imperial power, he can alter and change. and the like power (ſaith the gloſſe) hath the Pope in contracts pertayning to ſpiritual matters. But of altering the nature of natural things, neither the Emperour, nor the gloſſe dreamed.

Of vvhat things Popes or Princes can alter the nature.

29. But the words which Bel moſt vrgeth are, *that the Pope can make de nihilo aliquid ſomething of nothing. For* (ſaith he) *it is a thing proper to God to make ſomething of nothing in al caſes and at al tymes.* But beſides that the gloſſe neither ſaith that the Pope can make *de nihilo aliquid*, but *de nullo aliquid*, neither yet in al caſes, and al times, as Bel addeth: the foreſaid words are taken out of Iuſtinian. *C. de rei vxor. act. lib. 1.* where the Emperour ſaith, that becauſe he can make to be accompted a ſtipulation, where none is, much more he can an inſufficient ſtipulatiõ to be ſufficient: & the like authority in humane contracts touching ſpiritual matters, the gloſſe attributeth to the Pope? & this he meant when he ſaid, the Pope can *de nullo facere*

Of vvhat nothing Popes or Princes can make ſomething.

ere aliquid of no contract make one which Bel would applie to creatiō & making creatures of nothing as God made the world.

30. Secondlie he proueth his slaunder, out of Gersons report before answered, and thirdlie out of Gregory 9. saying. *Ad firmamentum Cæli &c. to the firmament of heauen that is of the vniuersal church, God made two lights, Pontifical authority, and power Roial, that we may know there is as much difference betweene Pope & Kings, as betwixt sunne & moone.* Is here any word of authority belonging to God? or yet of deposing Kings? but only a cōparison, of Pontifical & Royal power with the sunne & moone (allowed by the publique letters of three Princes electors) and a preferring of the Pontifical before the Royal, which if Bel had any feeling of Christianity in him he would not deny. Is not the loosing and binding of sinns in heauen & earth, of preaching the ghospel, admnistring the sacraments, of feeding Christs sheepe, and the like, which belongeth to Bishops, as is euident out of scripture, far more excellent then Royal power? which as wel woemen and children, as men: infidels, as Christians may haue.

Gregor. 9. lib. 1. de cren. tit. 33. c. 6.

Written 1279. *and one extāt in* Baron. tom. 10. an. 996. *Matth.* 16. *vers.* 19. & 18. *Iob.* 21. 7. 15. 16. *Act.* 20. 7. 18. *Matth.* 28. 7. 19.

31. The sunne & moone are of the same nature and quality, differing only in more or lesse light, but Royal power is both of nature

Royal power far inferiour to Pontifical

Constantin called Bishops Gods and professed him self vnder them Ruffin. lib. 1. hist. c. 2.

nature and quality far inferiour to Pontifical: thas is more humane and begun by men, this supernatural and instituted by God: that common to Infidels, this proper to christians: that passeth not earth, this reacheth to heauen: that concerneth only the body, this the soule: that helpeth men to worldlie and transitorie quietnes, this to heauenlie and euerlasting rest. Bel could not abide Pope Gregory saying Pontifical authority excelled Royal as far as the sunne excelleth the moone, nor the glosse saying, it excelled it 47. times, how then wil he abide S. Chrisostom saying, *it excelleth the kingdome as much as the soule douth the body*, or S. Ambrose saying *that nothing can be equal to Pontifical dignity, and that Royal glorie, and Princes crownes, are far more inferiour to it, then lead is to glistering gould.* And againe *nothing in this world is more excellent then priests, nothing higher then Bishops.* or S. Ignatius saying *that nothing is more honourable in the church then Bishops, and that we owe the first honour to God, the second to Bishops, the third to Kings.* he exclamed against the glosse for affirming the Pope to haue celestial arbitremēt, what wil he say to S. Chrisostome (worthely in his own iudgment Sirnamed the gouldē mouthed doctor) auouching *that the Priests throne is in heauen, that he hath authority to iudge of celestial busines, and that God hath put the*

Chrisost. l. 3. de sacerd.
Ambros. lib. de dignit. sacerd. c. 2.
Ibid. cap. 3.
Ignat. epist. ad Smirnenses.
Chrisost. hom. 5. in illud Esaiæ vidi Dominum, & hom. 4. item hom. 60. ad populum.

the verie Princes head vnder the hands of the priest, to teach vs that the priest is a Prince greater then he. And in an other place affirmeth *a Deacon to haue greater power then an Emperour, and aduiseth vs that vvho dispiseth the Priest, at length falleth to contemne God.* and S. Gregory writing to the Emperour him selfe saith priests are certaine Gods amongst men, and therefore to be honoured of al euen of Kings. But Bel in debasing priesthood, and too too much exalting Princes, sheweth him selfe to be a right Apostata from priesthood, and a right heretike, who, as Themistius said, *honour not God but Princes.* And thus much of Bels eight steppes.

hom. 83. in Matth. *Hom. 2. in 2. in Timoth.* *Gregor. lib. 4. epist. 31.* *S. Ciprian. lib. 3. epist. 9.* *noteth that the beginning of Schismes & Heresies is by contempt of Priests and Bishops.* *Themistius in l. consul. apud Socratem. l. 3. c. 25.* *Arian Bishops more for the palace then for the Church.* *Hilar. l. cõr. Constant.*

32. Thus thou seest Christian reader that of these eight steps, which Bel imagined the Pope had to climbe to his superiority ouer Princes, two of them to wit the first and secõd were steps rather to fal, then to climbe by, three vz. the fourth, sixth, and seauenth, were euident acts of such authority alreadie enioyed, & acknowledged by Princes, the third was but a recouery of his auntient libertie, the sieft is no more a step for the Pope to climbe, then temporal huings are to other bishops. And the eight and last is a manifest vntruth. But the true step he omitted, which is Christs promise to S. Peter to build his Chruch vpon him. and his

Matth. 16. v. 18. *Ioan. 21. v. 17.*

commission to feed his sheepe, by vertue whereof, al S. Peters successours challendge to be spiritual superiour to al that are in Christs church, or be his sheepe, be they Princes, or subiects, as is euident out of the foresaid decree of Boniface 8.

Bonif 8. extrauag. vnã sanctam. de maioritate & obedientia.

Sed epist. Ioan. 2 ad Iustinianum Imper. Gregor. lib. 1. epist. 24.

33. Bel hauing thus (as you haue beard) slandred Popes, thought not to let ether Kings, or Emperors passe free, but saith that *some of them haue opened the windovv to al Antichristian tyrany*. Greater iniury he could not do to Christian Princes, then to accuse them of such horrible impiety of opening the windaw not to some, but to al Antichristian tirany. No maruel if he spare nether Pope nor Priest, who thus handleth Princes? If one ask proofe of his slander, he bringeth none, but it suffizeth that he hath said it, his word alone is sufficient to condemne many Kings, & Emperors. This is the respect Protestants beare, euen to the greatest Monarches, when they are against their proceedings. So Luther said *Princes for the most parte vvere ether the verieſt fooles or arranteſt knaues*. And againe. *The Turk is ten tymes better and vviſer then the Emperor, and other Princes vvhome he cals idiots doults, madde, furiours, and frantik fooles*, and namely King Henry 8 he reciteth with such shameful, such spitful, and scurrilous tearmes as I am ashamed to write.

Bel pag. 17. Bel slandereth Princes.

Luther. lib. de secular. potest. edit. 1523.

lib. cont. duo edicta Cæsaris 1524.

Lib. cont. Hentic. Regem Angl.

to write. And amongst Protestants nothing more vsual then to cal Princes, Antichrists, and slaues of Antichrist.

34. Bel not yet satisfied with iniuring the Pope, addeth *that he hath made it sacriledge to dispute of his powver*, which is a manifest vntruth disproued by him selfe art: 2. p: 26 where he affirmeth that *the Pope alloweth Bellarmins Works*, who at large disputeth of his power. And because Sigebert (whome Bel vntruly calleth the Popes deare fryer, for he was his vtter enemy, and to his power fauored the schismatical and Excommunicated Emperor Henry 3, in whose behalfe he fained diuers things as Baron. proueth tom. 9. An. 774.) reprehendeth them, who taught the people that they owe no obediēce to euil Kings, Bel inueyeth against Catholiques. Whereas Catholiques vttrely defie such Doctrin, & condēned it lōg since in the Protestants great grandfather wiclife and haue learned of the first Pope S. Peter *to be subiect in al feare, not onely to good and modest maisters, but also to wayward.* But Protestants teach that and worse Doctrin, as appeareth by what hath bene sayd before, and by Godman, who (as Couel writeth) *published to the world, that it was lawful to kil wicked Kings, and Whitingham a deane of no smal account, in his preface before Godmans booke, af-*

pag. 17. vntruths 26.

vntruths 27.

Trithem. in Sigebert.

Baronius.

Art. 15. damnat. in Concil. Constantien.

1. Pet. c. 2. v. 18.

Cap. 3. parag. 4. 5. 6.

Couel of Church gouernment. c. 4. p. 35.

Proteſtants think it lawful to kil euil Kings.

Bel pag. 18. 28 vntruth 29 vntruth 30 vntruth

firmed it to be the doctrin of the beſt learned, meaning (as Couel thinketh) *Caluin and the reſt.*

35. Finally becauſe the end of this article should not be vnlike the beginning he concludeth it with three vntruthes as he began it, ſaying. *That the Popish religion hath bene alwaies condemned of great learned Papiſts.* If he had named the men, and points of religion, as he told the tyme, the three vntruthes wold haue appeared in their likenes. As I gueſſe he meaneth of the Popes power for depoſing Princes, which I confeſſe ſome Papiſts haue denyed, but nether were they the greateſt learned men, nor alwayes were there any ſuch, nor hath he proued it to be a point of Popish religion; And thus much of Bels firſt Article. *Wherfore remember* (Bel) *from whence thou art fallen and doe pennance.* Apoc: 2.

***

THE

THE SECOND ARTICLE TOVCHING THE MASSE.

PREFACE.

Bel deuideth this Article into foure members, in the firſt wherof he impugneth the real preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt; in the ſecond the ſacrifice of the Maſſe; in the third he inueigheth againſt the recantation which Berengarius made when he adiured Bels hereſie; and in the fourth he treateth of apparent contradictions which (ſaith he) are in the Maſſe. And the like method we wil keepe in our anſwer.

CHAP. I.

Bels reaſon againſt the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the B. Sacrament anſwered, his vntruth and diſſimulation therin diſcouered.

S. Paul prophetied. *That in the laſt tymes ſome shal depart from the faith, attending to the ſpirits of errors and doctrin of diuils.* Which prophecy is moſt manifeſtly fulfilled in theſe heretiks who impugne the Catholique doctrin 1. Timoth. 4. v. 1.

Berengarius

ctrin of the B: Sacrament. For of Berengarius (first publike enemy of this Sacrament) Malmesburienses an English Chronicler of his tyme, writeth, that when he came te visit S. Fulbert B: of Charters lying on his death bed, *the holy Bishop commanded him to be put forth, protesting that he did see a huge diuil standing by him, and corrupting many to follow him by his flattering hand and alluring breath.*

Malmesbur. lib. 3. in Guilielmo 1. p. 114.

Luther. Sanctes repetit. de Euchar. c. 10. Bellarm. l. 1. de Missa c. 5. Surius in comment. 1534. Genebrard. in chron. Erasm. cont. epist. non sobriam Lutheri. Carolstadius. Zuinglius. 1 in dan. ep. dissuasor. p. 114. Oecolampadius. Brent. in Recognit. Iezlerus lib. de diuturn. belli eucharist.

2. Luther himselfe confesseth l. de Missa Angul: to: 7: fol: 228. to haue disputed visibly with the diuil and bene perswaded by him to abrogate Masse. And of this his conference with the diuil, besides others, Erasmus a ioly confesser in Fox his calender is a most sufficient witnes. To Carolstadius a great frend at the first of Luther appeared a diuil as he was preaching as testifieth Erasmus Alberus. Zwinglius an ager enimy of the real presence testifieth of him selfe l. de subsid: Euchar: That about the Eucharist he was instructed of a spirit *which* (saith he *I know not, whether it was black, or white.* And Luther l. cit: writeth that he thinketh Oecolampadius, & others to haue bene choked by the diuil. And the Lutherans cal the Zinglians diuilish heretiks, possessed and obsessed of diuils and their opinions diabolical.

3. Fi-

3. Finally Caluin, epist: ad Bucer. confesseth that he had a familier, to which he imputeth his vaine of cursing. Thus we see the very Fathers of Protestantisme to haue bene haunted, and instructed of diuils. Who therefore can doubt but their doctrin is the doctrin of diuils, and they, such as hauing departed from the Catholique faith, wherein they were christend, and bred, did hatken to the spirits of errors, and teach the doctrin, which they had learnd of the diuil appearinge in visible forme. Now let vs see how Bel like a good scholer defendeth his black maisters and oppugneth the Catholique, doctrin. Caluin. Genium.

4. He begineth his second Article as he did the first, with a syllogisme with dissimulation, and vntruth. *Aquinas* (saith he) *Bellarm: the Councel of Trent, and the rest of the Romish borood hold constantly, as an article of their Christian faith, that the true organical and natural body of Christ, which is localy in hauen, is also truly, and really vnder the forme of bred and Wine in the sacrifice of the masse: but this* (saith he) *is impossible, as which implyeth flat contradiction: ergo &c.* I accept Bels confession of the Catholiques constancy in their faith, which is a vertue far from him selfe, who hath twise altered his religion. *Bel pag. 19.* 31. *vntruth.* Conc. Trid. sess. 13. can. 1. Aquinas 3. p. q. 6. art. 1. Bellarm. l. 1. de Euchar. c. 2. *Catholiques constant in their faith.*

3. dissimulation.

5. Bels dissimulation is euident, for he could not be ignorant that Luther, and his Lutherish brood hold the real presence of Christs body, and blood in the Eucharist, no les then Catholiques, though otherwise then they doe. For Luther accurseth them and accounteth them blasphemers, and damned foreuer, and in plaine tearmes defineth them to be *heretiques and out of Gods church, who denie the body and bloud of Christ to be receaued with carnal mouth in the venerable Eucharist.* This was Luthers sentence & iudgemēt vpō them that deny the real presence, which his brood defend with tooth and nayle, as is euident by their endlesse and mortal warres against the Zuinglians and Caluinists, whereof two Protestants haue written two bookes.

Luther. in præfat. lib. Sueuarum. In postrema confes. fidei de cena Domini. Et thesi. 15. & 27.

Ioan. Lauatherus. Ioan. Iecle-rus.

6. Bels want of fidelitie appeareth in this proposition whereof he maketh no doubt. For albeit al Catholiques beleue as a point of their faith, that Christs true and natural body and the very selfe same which in heauen is organical, is in the B: Sacrament: yet nether the Councel of Trent, S. Thomas nor Bellarmin in the places quoted by Bel, affirme as a point (and much lesse as an Article) of their faith, that it is there organical. For organization being an accident of the body depending of quantity, they hold

Conc. Trid. sess. 13. can. 1. S. Thom. 3. p. q. 76. art. 1. Bellarm. lib. 1. de Euchar. c. 2.

hold no otherwise his organization, then they do his quantity to be in the Sacrament. The Councel onely defineth whole Christ, that is euery substantial part of him to be in the Eucharist, without any mention of his quãtity or other accidents as appeareth by the words of the Canon. *If any shal deny the body and blood together with the soul & Diuinity of our Lord Iesus Christ, and consequently whole Christ to be in the Eucharist &c. be he accursed.* And in the same sense sayd S. Thom: 3 p: q. 76 ar: 1. that according to the Catholique faith whole Christ is in the Sacrament. And though art: 4. he teach that Christs quantity is also in the Sacrament, yet affirmeth he it not as a point of faith. In like sorte Bellarm: in the place which Bel citeth teacheth, and truly, that Christs quantity is in the Sacrament, but not with Bels addition, as a point of faith. And though l 3. de Euchar: c. 5. he cal it the common sentence of the Schooles and Church, yet condemneth he not the contrary as heretical, but onely as false and erroneous. And as for Durand accom Gabriel Maior, and Satus also as Sainctes reporteth (whome Bel can not deny to be of the Romish brood as he scornefully speaketh) they thought that Christs body had not his quãtity in the Sacrament and consequently must

Durand. 4. d. 10. q. 2. Occam 4. q. 4. & tract. de Eucharist. c. 29. maior. q. 2. Gabr. art. 2. concl. 2. & lect. 43. in Can.

must needs thinke that it was not their organical. And to disproue Bel, Iuel in his apologie writeth, that some Papists affirme Christs quantity to be in the Eucharist, others deny it. For some being perswaded in Philosophy, that quantity essentially requireth aptitudinal commensuration to place, so that if it be put in a place it must needs be coextended to the place, & thinking that they cold sufficiently verifie Christs words by teaching the substance of his body to be in the Sacrament denied his quantity to be there, saying that God supplieth the effect therof so far forth as is necessary for the soule to informe the body, as in al Deuines opinion, he supplieth the effect of coextension to place, which also is a natural disposition required to life and information of a body or matter. But other Deuines of greater learning and grauity (iudging it an inconuenient thing to graunt Christs liuely body to want in the Sacrament his quantity and figure, and considering better of the nature of quantity, found that no commensuration to place was essential vnto it, but onely a natural propriety, and therefore separable by Gods power from it, as light is from the Sunne) taught that Christs hath his quantity in the Sacrament as a natural accident accompaning his body. And albeit this be a certaine

a certaine truth and not onely the common opinion of Schooles but seemeth also to be common sense of Catholiques, yet saith Suarez a learned author Tom: 3. in 3. part. disput: Si stec: 2. *It is to hard a censure to condemne the contrary of heresie. For* (saith he) *I find nether expresse definition nor irrefragable testimony of Scripture against it, nor yet any thing which can be convinced out of reuealed principles, and al the reasons maid against it are, deduced out of Philosophical Principles, true and certaine but not altogether euident.* In like sorte Claudius de Sainctes repetit. 4. de Euchar: c. 4. testifieth that this matter is not clearly defined by the Church or Scripture. What shame therfore must it be to Bel to auouch that al Catholiks hold as a point of their faith that Christs body is organical in the Eucharist, and declining the principal question about the being of Christs body in the Sacrament (which is an vndoubted point of our faith, and against which his cheefe argument, which as he saith al the Papists in England can not answer taketh no hold) to impugne the being of Christs quantity in the Eucharist.

Suarez.

Sainctes.

7. Neuertheless because it is a thinge most true and most agreable to our faith. I willingly vndertake the defense therof. Let vs see therfore how Bel disprouеth it. For sooth

pag 20. Reason the ground of Bels faithe.

sooth *because it implyeth contradictiõ for a greater body as Christs is to be cõtained in a lesser as in a cake.* Behould the foundation of Bels faith, the best weapon of this stout challenger, the strong reason which al English Papists can not solue. We bring Christs expresse words auouching that what he gaue to his Apostle at his last supper *was his body giuen, and his blood shed for remission of sinnes,* which vndoubtedly he ment of his true body and blood. For he neuer gaue bred, nor shed wine for remission of sinnes. We obiect also his other words where he calleth his flesh *truly meat and his blood drinke,* as it were, preuenting the figuratiue exposition of Caluinists. Besids the words of S. paul testifying, that *who receaueth vnvvoorthily the B: Sacrament is guilty* (not of bread and wine il receaued) but *of the body and blood of our Lord.*

Scripture. Matth 26. v.26 28. Marc.14.v. 22.24. Luc. 22. v. 19 20. 1.Cor.11.v. 24.25. Ioan. 6. v. 55. 1.Cor.11.v. 29.

Fathers. 8. To these testimonies of holy writte we adioyne the vniforme consent of Fathers, who not onely continually cal the Eucharist the body, and blood of Christ, and not once a bare figure, but withal some of them affirme that *it is no bare figure, but the very body,* and damne the contrary, *as abhominable and extreme madnes,* contrary to tradition *of Apostles, and Fathers, and against the verity and propriety of Christs vvords.* Others deny it *to be bread albeit our taste so iudge.*

Damasc.l. 4. de fid.c.14. 7. Synod. Act. 6. Chrysosto. hom. de Eucharist. in Eucenijs. Cyrill. catech.3.

Others

Others say *that the nature of bread is changed, that bread changed in nature, not in shew; is by the omnipotency of God made flesh: that bread and wine are turned supernaturally into the verity of Christs proper flesh.* Others say *we eate Christs flesh and drink his blood with our mouthes, that what we beleue with faith we receaue with mouth.* Others auouch *that Christ at his last supper carried him selfe secundum literã* (that is truly & really) *in his hands.* Finally others say that *as Christ is the true sonne of God, so is it true flesh & blood which we receaue and drinke.* These kind of speeches and many other of the like sort can neuer be verified, vnles the real presence of Christ in the B. Sacrament be defended.

Nissen. orat. mag. catech. c. 37. Cipria. serm. de Cœna. Cyril. Alex. ad Calosyr. Chrysosto. hom. cit. Damas. sup. August. lib. 2. cont. aduers. legis & Prophet. c. 9. tom. 6. Leo serm. 6. de ieiun. 7. mensis. Aug. serm. 1. in psalm. 33. tom. 8. Hilar. 8. de Trinitat.

9. Against al these irrefragable testimonies of Gods word, and holy Fathers, Bel opposeth humane reason, though he expound them figuratiuely, because he dare not deny them in bare words which hath bene euer the shift of heretiques. For so the Arrians being vrged with these words, *I and the Father are one* expounded them figuratiuely, because they durst not deny them, and their reason could not conceaue how two persons should be one nature. Likwise the Marcionits vnderstood those words. *The word was made flesh* figuratiuely because by reason they could not vnderstand how

Quod intelligimus debemus rationi quod credimus authoritati. Aug. l. de vtil. cred. c. 11. *Heretiques shift to expound scriture figuratiuely.* Ioan. 10. v. 30. *Heretiks be figure flingers.* Io. 1. v. 14.

how two natures shold be in one person. And for the self same cause Bel and Protestants vnderstand these words, *This is my body giuen for you, my blood shed for you in remission of sinns*, figuratiuely. For these words doe as playnly teach the verity of Christs body and blood in the Eucharist, as those other teach the verity of his Godhead or humanity, yea more plainly, because in these words it is expressed what body, and blood is in the Eucharist, vz. that which was giuen for vs and shed in remission of sinnes, which kind of addition is not in those other words.

Tantum veritati obstrepit adulter sensus quantum corruptor stilus. Tertull. lib. de præscript.

Scripture teacheth more plainly Christs real presence in the Sacrament then it doth his Godhead and humanity.

10. But as S. Austin saith *If an opinion of error haue preoccupated the mind, whatsoeuer is otherwise affirmed in Scripture men will vnderstand it figuratiuely.* Hereupon Caluin said *that the reuerence of Gods word was no sufficient pretence to reiect his reasons*: And calleth it *foolish stubbernes to contend vpon the words of Scripture, and them catchers of sillables, foolish, superstitious, who stick fast to Christ words.* What is this good Reader but to make reason the rule of faith, and not to captiuate our vnderstanding to Gods word, but to captiuate it to our reason, and make it speake properly, or figuratiuely, according as reason can comprehend it. Truly therfore wrote the Magdeburgian Protestants of such

S. Augustin. lib. 3. de doctrin. Christian. cap. 10. tom. 3. Caluin. 4. instit. c. 17. parag. 10. & 23.

Magdeburg. in præfat. centur. ad reginam Elizabeth.

such as deny the real presence. *With philosophical reasons they so make voyd the testament of God, that the body and blood of Christ concerning the presence and communication therof according to Christs owne most clere, most euidēt, & most powerful words, they wholie remoue, & with maruelous perplexity of words doe coulorably deceiue.*

11. But to come to Bels reason. How proueth he it to be cōtradiction for a greater body to be conteyned in a les. Surely not at al, but as Pithagoras *autos epha* or as Faustus the Manichist who as S. Austin writeth *sayd it, and avvay.* Should not he want al reason, who for such a reason proposed without al proofe, should forsake Christs expresse words, and plaine testimonies of holy Fathers? Breefly I might answere with S. Ambrose. *What seekest thou the course of nature in Christs body, seing he was against natures order borne of a virgin*, and admonish Bel of the faithles Capharnaits asking. *How can he giue his flesh to be eaten?* For to what other end tendeth Bels reason then to aske. How can God giue vs his flesh? Let him harken to S. Chrisostome, S. Ephrem and others, aduising him not to be curious but faithful, not to trust to humain sense, and reason, which is oftētymes deceaued, but to Christs word. *He hath said* (writeth S. Chrisostome) *This is my body, let vs haue no doubt, albeit it seeme absurd*

S. Aug. l. 14. cont. Faust. c. 9.
S. Ambros. l. de initiatis. c. 9. tom. 4.
Ioan. 6. 7. 52.
Omnes hæreticorum & Gentilium quæstiones eædem sunt quia non Scripturarum auctoritatem sed humanæ rationis sensum sequūtur. Hieron. in Olea 7.
S. Chrisost. hom. 60. ad populum & 83. in Matth.
S. Ephren. lib. de natura Dei minime scrutanda.
Chrisosto. sup.

absurd to our sense, and reason, which he sayth let his word in al matters, but especially in the sacraments ouercome our sense, and reason, which is oftentymes deceiued, as Bels is here.

How it is contradiction for a greater body to be in a les, and how not.

12. For albeit it be contradiction for a greater body occupying a place proportionate to it greatnes, to be contayned in a les (for so it should be both contayned, and not conteyned in the les:) yet no contradiction at al it is for a greater body retayning it greatnes, to be so coarcted by Gods omnipotency, as it fil a place far les, then is naturaly due, or proportionate to it greatnes. For in this case it followeth not, that it shold both be contayned, & not contayned in the lesser body (as in the former case) but contayned onely. And thus we say hath Christ disposed of his body in the sacramẽt. And that God cã thus dispose of bodies, we doe not onely barely affirme, as Bel doth the contrary, but can proue by many waies.

Proofs that God can put a greater body in a lesser.

S. Beda in Lucam.
S. August. de hæres. c. 82. tom. 6.
Ambr. ep. 81.
Leo ser. 1. & 2. de natiu.
Nissen. ser. de occursu Domini.
Damasc. l. 4. de fid. c. 14.

13. First becausse Christs body in his natiuity opened not his virgin mothers womb. *Ergo* then it occupied not a roome naturally proportionat to the greatnes. The consequence is euident. The Antecedent I proue, becausse it is a point of the Catholique faith as testify S. Bede and S. Austin, and appeareth by vniuersal consent of al Fathers as S. Ambrose: S. Leo: S. Nissen, S. Damascen: and

and others, and professed in our Creed, that Christ was borne of a virgin, which vndoubtedly is ment of a perfect virgin, as wel in body, as mind. And the contrary was the heresie of Iouinian, who (as S. Austin writeth) affirmed that our Ladies virginity was lost *pariendo* by child bearing, which he could not otherwise vnderstand then by the Childs opening her womb, because virginity can not be otherwaies lost *pariendo* by child bearing, and sure it is she lost not virginity by conceauing.

Ideo clausa quia virgo. Ambr. de instit. virg. c. 7. August. sup. & l. 1. cont. Iul. c. 2. to. 7.

Iouinian sayd Christs body shold be a phantasme if our lady had remayned a virgin in her trauail.

14. Moreouer holy Fathers proue this truth out of that prophecy of Ezechiel 44. v. 2. *of a gate shut and not opened by vvhich the Lord alone should passe* vnderstanding by this shut and vnopened gate the virginal womb of our B: Ladie. And Albeit some Fathers vse the word of opening the womb in their speech of our Ladies child birth, yet they meane not properly, but vse the name of the effect for the natural cause therof. For because children naturally do open their mothers wombs, both Scripture, and Fathers do sometymes cal child bearing opening the womb, and barennes shutting the womb. Of Scripture this is euident out of Gen: 20: 29: 30. & 1. reg: 1. of Fathers it is manifest by S. Hierome who though he say Christ opened the gate of the virgins

Aug. cont. Iul. cit. Hieron. in Ezechiel. 44. Ambros. lib. de instit. virginis c. 7. Aug. serm. 18. de tempore.

S. Hierom. dial. 1. cont. Pelagian.

womb, yet he addeth *that it continually remayned shut*, whereby he explicateth how before he took the opening vz. of Child bearing without any propet opening, for otherwiſe the womb could not remayne ſtil shut.

15. Neuertheles Proteſtants, becauſe it maketh for the Catholique Doctrin of the B: Sacrament, deny the Antecedent, and Willet proueth their denyal, becauſe as S. Luke ſaith, *Chriſt vvas preſented in the temple according to the lavv. Euery male opening the matrice shalbe holy to the Lord.* But by the like reaſon he might proue that Chriſt was conceiued by mans ſeed, becauſe S. Luke in the ſame chapter writeth that our Lady was purifyed according to Moiſes law, which was as we read leu: 12. of *a vvoman which hauing receaued ſeed had borne a male child.* The anſwere to both places is the ſame. Becauſe naturally women conceiue by receauing ſeed,& children are borne by opening their wombs, therfore the law vſed theſe termes. But as the one law affirmed not, that no woman could conceiue without receauing ſeed,ſo nether the other,that no child could be borne without opening his mothers womb. And as willets hereſy made him to open our Ladies wõb,ſo his cõſcience made him to shut it againe. For why should he teach

Willet cont. 13. p. 453.

S. Luc. 2. v. 23.

teach that it was shut after her deliuery, if he did not thinke the opening did preiudice her virginity? The like proofe might be drawne out of Christs entring to his Apostles the dores being shut saith S. Luke, and of his issuing out of the sepulchar before the Angel had remoued the stone. See S. Hilarie lib. cont. Constant. prope fin.

16. Secondly God can by his omnipotency bring a Camel through a needles eye as wel as a rich man into heauen: but he can bring a rich man to heauen keeping his riches, Ergo a Camel keeping his greatnes through a needles eye. The Proposition is euident out of our Sauiours words Math. 19. v. 24. 26. The Assumption is manifest and approued by S. Austin epist. 89. quæst. 4. And the same S. Austin lib. de spir. & lit. c. 1. and Nazian. Orat. 36. affirme that it is possible for God to draw a Camel through a needles eye. Thirdly God made the fornace of Babilon, though neuer so hote, not to heate, yea to refresh the three children, why then can he not make a great body to occupy but a smale roome? For to occupy place is an effect and accident of quantity, as to heate is of heate. Moreouer nature by condensation doth make a body to occupy lesse roome then is due vnto it, as appeareth in the freesing of water, and this it doth with out destroying any quantity therof, S. Augustin. tom. 2. S. Gregor. Nazianz. Daniel. 3.

as many excellent Philosophers euen by natural reason do gather. And can not God work the like effect without condensation by some other supernatural meanes? Finally Bel teacheth that euery sinne of it nature excludeth grace, and yet God of his power maketh some sinne to stād with grace: why then can he not make quantity to exclude no body out of the place, though of it nature it should so doe. And thus much touching Bels reason. Now let vs see his authorities.

Bel art. 6 p. 81.

Chap. II.

The Authorities alledged by Bel against the Real Presence answered.

Bel pag. 20. After the forsaid reason he alledgeth some few authorities. The first is of Caietan who *affirmed as Angles* (saith he) *reporteth. That ther is no text that commeneth the Reader to vnderstand these words. This is my body properly.* But Bel greatly wrongeth both Caietan and Angles, in changing the word *Heretik* into *Reader*. For Angles in 4 q. 4. attributeth that opinion to Caietan onely concerning Heretiks, and addeth q. 5. that *he seemeth to haue recalled it.* But how conuincent the Scripture is in this point let Bel learne of Luther writing. That *he vvas willing to deny the real presence and endeuored vvithal his power,*

Luther. ep. ad Argentinenses. vid. Bellarm. lib. 1. de Euch. c. 1.

power, but could not satisfy the Scripture.

2. But suppose Caietan had said as Bel alledgeth. what then? Doth he therfore deny the real presence, or think those words not to be vnderstood properly? no surely? yea he plainly auoucheth both. Or doth Bel think that euety point of faith is so euidētly delyuered in Scripture, as the very words suffice to cōuince any reader though neuer so obstinate? why then are not al heretiks cōuerted by reading Scripture? yea why admytteth he a tradition which is not at al in Scripture? If not, why inferreth he the Scripture not to teach the real presence if it teach it not clearly? *Bel p. 134. 135.*

3. The second is S. Tho: Aquinas *whoe* (saith he) *affirmeth constantly. Corpus Christi non esse in pluribus locis simul, secundum proprias dimensiones, that Christs body is not in many places at once, according to the proper dimensions therof.* Whose assertion (saith Bel) is my flat position. But Bel herein 1. contradicteth him selfe 2. belyeth S. Thomas 3. vnderstandeth him not. He contradicteth him selfe, for before he said Aquinas held constantly as an article of the Christian faith, that the true body of Christ is truly and really in the Sacrifice of the Masse: & now he saith that he affirmeth constantly an assertion which is Bels flat position to the contrary. How *S. Thom. 4. d.10.q.1.art. 1.* *Bel p. 20.* *Contradict. 9.* *vntruth 32.*

can Aquinas hold constantly two contradictory points? He belyeth Aquinas, for he is so far from maintayning Bels position, as in the very place which Bel citeth, his conclusion is this. *Vnder the Sacrament of the altar, is contayned the true body of Christ which he tooke of the Virgin, and to say the contrary is heresie.* Lastly he vnderstandeth not Aquinas. For he thinketh that Aquinas by the forsaid words meaneth, that Christs body can not be in many places at once with his proper dimensions, & therupon inferreth, that Aquinas thinketh Christs body can not be in many places at once, because (saith Bel) *it can not be without those dimensions which naturally pertayne vnto it.* But (to omit Bels impious assertion, that God can not keep a body without his natural appurtenances) Aquinas meaning is playne and euident vz. That the total cause of Christs body being in two places at once, is not his owne dimẽsions alone, but they together with the dimensions of the body conuerted into his body. For he thinketh Christs owne dimensions to be the cause of his being in that place where he is naturally, and the dimensions of the body which is transubstantiated, the cause of his being, where he is Sacramentally. Which opinion of his, about the cause of Christs being in many places, maketh

Bel vnderstandeth not Aquinas.

maketh nothing to this purpoſe.

4. Thirdly he citeth Durand whom he ſaith holdeth the very ſame opinion. But in this alſo he both contradicteth him ſelfe, & belyeth Durand. For in the fourth member of this article, he telleth vs, that Durand *holdeth the forme of bread to be changed* vz. into the body of Chriſt. True it is that Durand (as before I cited) thinketh the quantity of Chriſts body not to be in the Euchariſt, yet neuertheles moſt conſtantly, he both affirmeth and proueth the ſubſtance of his body to be there. *Relp. 20. Contradict. 10. vntruth 33. p. 34.*

5. Fourthly he alledgeth S. Auſtin writing. *That Chriſt as man is in aliquo loco Cœli propter veri corporis modum: in ſome place of heauen for the manner of a true body.* Again. *His body muſt be in one place* Item. *He can not be at once in the Sun Moone and on the croſſe according to corporal preſence.* But in al theſe places he ſpeaketh of the natural manner of bodies being in place, as appeareth both by thoſe words (*propter veri corporis modum*) and becauſe he diſputeth againſt the Manichiſts, who douted (as the Proteſtant vbiquiſts doe now) that becauſe Chriſts body was vnited to his Godhead, it therby became euery where as God is, which (ſaith S. Auſtin) *is to deſtroy the nature of a true body, neither followeth it* (ſaith he) *that vvhat is in God be* *pag. 20.* S. Aug. epiſt. 57. ad Dardanum. De conſecrat. diſt. 2. con. Prima quidem. lib. 20. cont. Fauſtum. c. 11. tom. 6. Ex Auguſt. epiſt. cit. Ibid.

euery vvhere as God is.

6. But that Christs body being naturally in one place, might be Sacramentally in an other S. Austin neuer doubted, yea expresly affirmeth ser: 1. in psal: 33. where, he saith. *That Christ at his last supper carried him selfe in his ovvn hands secundum literam* (that is truly and properly) *and as no other man can carry him selfe.* And lib: de cur: pro: mort. c. 16. He doubteth whether Martyrs be at once in different places which argueth that he thought they could be. And S. Chrisostom hom: 17. in epist: ad hebr: *In many places is offered not many Christs, but the same Christ euery vvhere, here and there vvhole, one body not many bodyes.* And thus much of Bels first member of this article against the real presence. Now let vs proceed to the second against the Masse.

S. Augustin. tom. 8.

S. Augustin. tom. 4.

S. Chrisost. tom. 4.

Chap. III.

The Masse proued, Bels argument against it answered and his manifold vntruthes therin disproued.

S. Ignatius epist. ad Smyrnen. writeth of old heretiks. *That they admit not oblation and Eucharist, because they confesse not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour vvhich suffered for our sins.* And therfore no maruel if Bel hauing in the former member impugned

S. Ignatius apud Theodoretum. dialog. 3.

pugned the real presence, do in this inueigh against the oblatiō or sacrifice of the Masse, where, according to Christs owne action and institution, his body and blood vnder the formes of bread and wine, are offered vnto almighty God. That Christ at his last supper made an oblation to God is proued many waies.

Christ offered sacrifice at his last supper.

1. First because he did then giue his body vnto some, for his Apostles: But to no other then to God. Ergo to him he then offered his body. The proposition I proue, because he sayd not this is my body which is giuen to you, but for you, and al the Greek and English Bibles haue in the present tense *which is giuen, which is shed.* Therfore then did he giue his body, and shed his blood to some person for his Apostles, though soone after he gaue, and shed them after an other manner on the Crosse. Secondly because in S. Luke it is sayd of the Cup that is was powered out for remission of sins: but at the passion there was no Cup powred out. Ergo at supper the Cup was powred out for remission of sins. The proposition is out of the Greeke text, wher the word *powred out* agreeth with the Cup, and with none els *touto to potcrion en to aimati mou to ecchunomenon*. The assumption is playne for ther was no Cup at the passion.

1.

2. *Luc. 22. 7. 19. 20.*

Thirdly

3. Thirdly at the same tyme when Christs body was broken, it was giuen, and his blood shed for remission of sins 1. Cor. 11. v. 24. But it was in no sort broken on the Crosse as appeareth by S. Ihon. 19. v. 36. and in some sorte broken at the supper, because it was really vnder the forme of bread which was broken, therfore then his body was giuen for remission of sins.

3. Many things more might haue bene said in defence of Masse which are largely, and learnedly handled by Bellarm. in his 2. booke de Missa to. 2. and somthing shalbe added hereafter as breuity wil permit, and occasion shal serue. Onely here because the Reader may perceiue from what spirit the hatred of Masse proceedeth I aduertise him that Luther writeth of him self, that he had said Masse 15. yeares togither thinking it had bene a holy thing, vntil on a time Sathan appearing visibly vnto him, and disputing with him against Masse, perswaded him to detest it. From this spirit proceeded first the hatred of Masse, and this confession God wold Luther shold him self make, and publish in print, that al Christians who had any care of their souls, shold detest such doctrin, which the cheefe precher therof professeth he learnt of the diuel, & highly reuerēce that which the diuel so much hateth.

Denial of Masse proper doctrin of deuils.

Luther. l. de Missa angul. to. 7. fol. 218. Sainctes repetit. 1. de Eucharist. c. 10. Bellarm. l. 1. de Missa c. 5. Surius comment. 1534. 1517. Genebrard. in chron. See Erasmus cont. epist. nō sobriam Lutheri.

4. On

4. On the other syd S. Iames his Masse is yet extant, and Iewel in his sermon at Pauls Crosse 1560. confessed *that the Masse had Christs institution*. Which is breefly to confesse that Masse was instituted by Christ and the Apostles, and that our Masse is good, which in substance is al one with that of S. Iames. Likwise the Masses of S. Basil and S. Chrisostome are yet extant and at this day vsed of the Grecians, as the Masse of S. Ambros is vsed in Milan where he was Bishop, and of him self he writeth thus. *I abode in my function and began to say Masse.* S. Austins vse and reuerence of Masse appeareth by his words serm. 91. de temp. *In the lesson which shalbe read to vs at Masse &c.* and by his complaint ser: 251 of some that compelled the Priest to shorten the Masse and by his testimony of a miracle wrought, by offering the Sacrifice of Christs body l. 22. de ciuit: c: 8: which Sacrifice saith he con: 1. in psal: 33. 17. de ciuit: c. 5. & li: de fid: ad Pet: is frequented in al the world.

S. Iames Masse.

Rastal in confutat. P. 156.

S. Basil and S. Chrisost. Masse.

S. Ambros Masse. S. Ambrof. l. 5. epist. 33.

S. Augustin. tom. 10.

5. S. Gregories deuotion to Masse, him selfe testifyeth in these words we *euery day say Masse in veneration of Martyrs.* l. 7. epist: 29. Indict 1: And to omit the Councels of Ephesus, Agatha, Mileuit, & others, which approue Masse; it may suffice for Englishmen that certaine it is that S. Austin who first

S. Gregory. Councels. Tom. 1. Conciliorum. S. Beda lib. 2. histor. 23. 25. & 26.

first cõuerted our English nation to Christs faith, both said Masse and wrought miracles in confirmation of that faith & seruice of God which he preached. And in honor of Masse haue our Ancestors named diuers principal feasts of the year as Christ-masse Candle-masse Michael-masse Martin-masse, builded Churches, erected aultars, founded Monasteries, and endued Bishopricks and benefices, and liued and dyed in vse and honor of Masse. And not onely they, but al the Christian world as Grecians Armenians, Ethiopians, Moronits, Syrians, Russets & others, as testifyeth Chytreus a Protestant. And Caluin confesseth that the whole world beleued Masse to be a propitiatory Sacrifice, & that in this the Fathers are against him. And who is so careles of his saluation as to forsake the Fathers together with the whole world, and follow one lewd Minister condemned of buggery, as the authentical processe yet extant in Noioun doth record.

England nameth the feasts of the yeear of Masse.

Protestants cõfesse that al Christians vse Masse. Chytreus orat. de statu Ecclesiæ in Græcia. Caluin. l. 4. c. 18. & parag. 1. & 11. Lindan. epdissuasoria. p. 108.

6. Now then let vs heare Bels or rather the diuels arguments against Masse. *The Apostle* (saith he) *telleth vs that Christ rising from the dead dieth no more: The Papists tel vs that Christ dieth euery day, nay a thousand tymes aday in the daily Sacrifice of their Masse.* But better might we say that Bels tale of the Papists, con-

Bel p. 22. vntruthe 34.

conteyneth a thousand vntruthes. For Papists (as Caluin confesseth) l. 4. instit. c. 18. paragr. 5. professe. *That they neither vvil nor can kil Christ.* But say with Bellarmin. *That it is sacrileage to say that Christ dieth at Masse.* Yet wil Bel wring the contrary out of Bellarm: as water out of a flint. First because he graunteth. *That a Sacrifice implyeth intrinsecally the consumption of the thing sacrificed.* But this is answered out of Bellarmin teaching that Christ hath two kinds of being to wit naturally and Sacramentally. And the consumption of his Sacramental being, in the Masse, is no killing, because it is not by real separating his soule & body, but onely by consuming the Sacramental formes in which he was Sacramentally.

Caluin.

Bellarm. l. 2. de Missa. c. vltimo.

pag. 22.

Bellar. sup. c. 2.

Sup. cap. vltimo.

August. lib. 13. de ciu. c. 3.

Bel p. 22.

7. Againe *Bellarmin* (saith Bel) *telleth vs that Christs body and blood are offered truly and properly in the Masse.* True: and the like saith S. Austin, S. Ambros, S. Chrisostome, and others. But doth Bel think euery thing offered to God to be killed? then was Christ killed when he was offered in the temple, Samuel, when he was offered by his mother, and bread, wine, and frakincense offered in the law, were killed. Thirdly he proueth it out of Bellarmin, writing *that flesh and blood are not fit for meat vnles the beast* (as Bel translateth) *dye or be slayne*, Here Bel cold

Sup. cap. 13. S. August. l. 2. q. euangel. q. 3. S. Ambros. in psal. 38. & in 1. Luc. S. Chrisost. hom. 24. in 1. loc. & hom. 17. ad Hebr. *Luc.* 2. *v.* 22. 1. *Reg.* 1. *v.* 25. *Leuit. c.* 2. Bellar. l. 1. de Missa c. 12.

cold not imagin that Bellarmin ſpake of Chriſt (as in deed he doth not) vnles he think he called Chriſt a beaſt. But becauſe flesh and blood of beaſts are not fit for our meat before the beaſts be killed, he proueth by parity that Chriſts flesh and blood were not fit to be propoſed in manner of meat before he was ſacrifyced. And therupon gathereth that he did Saerifice him ſelfe at his laſt ſupper in an vnbloody manner, and after the order of Melchiſedech before he gaue his flesh, and blood as meat & drinke to his Apoſtles. Which reaſon he tooke out of S. Gregory Niſſen: whoſe words shalbe alledged herafter. And of Chriſts body Bellarm: profeſſeth. *That it taketh no hurt, nor leeſeth his natural being, when the Euchariſt is eaten.*

S. Gregor. Niſſen. homil. 1. de Reſurrectione. Sup. cap. vlt.

8. His fourth proofe is out of Bellarm: when he ſaith. *That a true and real Sacrifice requireth true and real killing quando in occiſione ponitur eſſentia ſacrificy*, which Bel tranſlateth thus *Seing the eſſence of a Sacrifice conſiſteth in killing, which* (ſaith he) *is the conſtant doctrin which S. Paule inculcateth to the hebrews*: 9: v. 17. 25: 26. 27. 28. But this proofe relyeth onely vpon Bels falſe tranſlating the word *Quando Seing* which he should haue tranſlated *When*. And Bellarmins mynd is that the true Sacrifice requireth true killing, when

Bellarm l. 1. de Miſſa. c. vltimo.

Bel pag. 22. *Falſe tranſlation. vntruth* 35.

when the essence therof consisteth in killing, as it doth in al bloody Sacrifices. But as for the Masse, he auoucheth it to be *no Sacrifice but Sacrledge to say that Priests really kil Christ.* And most false it is that S. Paul euer thought the essence of sacrifice to consist in killing. For beside the vnbloody Sacrifice of Melchisedech, he was not ignorant of diuers vnbloody Sacrifices in the old law, as of incense, for which there was a special aultar, and of bread and wine. And in the places quoted by Bel he affirmeth that it was necessary for Christ to dye, & by once dying to redeeme the world, which maketh nothing to this purpose. Loc. iam cit.

9. These proofs out of Bellarmin he confirmeth by *a constant position, and general receaued axiom* (as he saith) *in the Popish Church, that by vertue of the words of consecration Christs body is put a part from his blood, and his blood from his body, and he so slain.* But omitting Bels fond inferring Christ to be killed, if his body and blood be put a parte how soeuer, because not to put body and blood a parte where they were not before, but to separat them where they are vnited, is to kil: Els God should kil a man, if he created a soule and body a part. Omitting I say this fond illation, a manifest vntruth it is to affirme, that to be a constant position and gene- Bel pag. 25. vntruth 35.

general axiom in the Popish Church which she condemneth as heresie in these words. *Accursed be he who shal deny that whole Christ is contayned vnder either forme of bread and wine.* And the contrary is his Maister Luthers doctrin as testifyeth Bellarm: l. 1. de Euchar: c. 2.

Conc. Trid. sess. 13. can. 3. & c. 3.

10. But let vs heare what coulor he hath of this so notorious vntruth. *Bellarm:* (saith he) *teacheth. Ideo in cena seorsum consecratur corpus, & seorsum sanguis &c.* which Bel thus Englisheth. *Therfore is the body consecrated a parte in the supper, and the blood a sunder, that we may vnderstand the presence of the body, and blood in the supper, to be there after the manner of a body slayne, and dead.* But what? is to consecrate a parte, to put a parte? But Bellarm: telleth him that it is a far different thing, and that albeit Christs body and blood be seuerally consecrated, yet they are not seperated, nor one without the other in the Sacrament, because as the Coūcel of Trent saith, they are so naturally, and necessarily vnited in his resurrection, as they can be no more disioyned. Which vnion because they wanted in the tyme of Christs death, if then Masse had bene said, they had not onely bene consecrated seuerally but also put a parte. But what incōuenience inferreth Bel hereof? None at al. And thus much of his first argument against Masse.

Bel p. 23. Bellarm. l. 1. de Missa. c. 12.

Conc. Trid. sess. 13. c. 3.

S. Thom. 3. p. 476. art. 1.

The

CHAP. IIII.

The reſt of Bels arguments againſt Maſſe confuted.

HIS ſecond argument conſiſteth of many abſurdities, and groſſe impieties, which (ſaith he) follow of the Maſſe, & he reckeneth diuers. Firſt *that Chriſt at his laſt ſupper was both ſitting at table, and borne in his own hands.* But if this be abſurd and impious, impious, and abſurd was S. Auſtin, when he ſaid that Chriſt at his laſt ſupper *carried him ſelf in his hands ſecundum literam* that is properly, *and therin did more then any man can doe.* But what abſurdity is it more, then for a body to be in twoe places? for that being once done, one may carry him ſelf as wel as an other. As the ſoule becauſe it is in al parts of the body, as it is in the legges carrieth it ſelfe as it is in the body. The ſecond abſurdity is *that Chriſt at his laſt ſupper was both liuing and dead.* But this followeth not, for he was a liue in the Sacrament, though there he shewed no acts of life, and as long as he is a liue according to his natural being, he is neuer dead in the ſacrament, becauſe his ſacramental being is a memorial of his natural being repreſenting, and depending of it. Bel pag. 23. 24. S. Auguſtin. ſerm. 1. in pſalm. 33.

2. The third abſurdity is *that Chriſt was*

both visible and inuisible. Nether doth this follow. For though he were inuisible in the Sacrament, yet it is not true to say absolutely, he was inuisible, because he was there visible in his proper forme. But that he was visible in his proper forme, and inuisible in the sacrament, is no more absurd, then that after his resurrection he was visible to the Apostles, and inuisible to the Iewes, visible to S. Paul, and not to his Companions Act. 9. v. 7. Willet saith that S. Paul did see no man. But we wil rather beleue Ananias saying that *Christ appeared to him in the way.* Act. 9. v. 17. The fourth absurdity is, *that Christ was at his supper long and short, broad and narrow, light and heauy.* But rather these follow, for what length bredth or weight Christ had in his proper forme, the same he had in the sacrament, albeit it had not there the like effects of filling roome, or weighing; as nether he had when he was borne, and walked vpon the Sea.

Math. 29. Mar. 16. Luc. 20. Ioan. 20. 21.

Willet Cōtrou. 4. q. 3. p. 113.

Math. 14. Marc. 6. Ioan. 6.

3. The fift is, *that Christ was a sacrifice for our sins before he dyed for vs.* This which Bel condemneth of impiety, we haue before proued it out of Scripture to be certayne verity, & for such the holy Fathers auouch it, let Bel heare one or twoe for al. S. Gregory Nissen. orat. 1. de Resurrect. *Christ offereth him self an oblation and hoste for vs being both*

S. Gregor. Nissen.

both the Priest, and the lamb of God. When was this? When he gaue his body to be eaten and his blood to be drunk to his disciples. For it is manifest to euery one, that man can not eate of a sheepe vnles slaughtering goe before eating. Seing therfore he gaue his disciples his body to be eaten, he euidently shewed that the sacrifizing was already perfect, and absolute. S. Chrisostome also hom. de proditione Iudæ. tom. 3. saith. *On that table was celebrated both Paschaes of the figure, and of the verity.* Againe *Iudas was present, and partaked of that sacrifice.* And the Fathers are so playne for this matter, as Kemnitius confesseth they vsually say *that Christs body and blood was at this supper a sacrifice, an oblation, an hoste and victime*, and he could not escape their authorities, but by casting of a figure. S. Chrysost hom. Kemnitius.

4. The Sixt and last absurdity or impietie which Bel inferreth is *that al Christs sacrifice at his supper was imperfect, or at his passion needles.* But nether this followeth. For Christs sacrifice at his supper was a most perfect vnbloodly sacrifice according to the order of Melchisedech, and yet his sacrifice on the crosse was needful, as the peculier price which God exacted at his handes, for the redemption of the world, that as the apostle saith, by death he might destroy him, who had the Empier of death. For albeit not only Christs whole body and Hebr. 2. v. 15.

blood in the Eucharist, but euen the least drop of his blood, had been a sufficient sacrifice to redeeme the whole world: neuertheles God, partly to shew his great hatred towards sinne (wherof Christ bore the punishment: partly to manifest his infinite loue towards man kinde, for whose saluation he would not spare the life of his only sonne: partly for many other causes, exacted of Christ the superabundant price, and ransome of his bloody sacrifice on the crosse. But let vs heare how Bel disproueth this.

5. He citeth fowre places out of S. Paule Heb 9. and 10. to proue that one oblation of the crosse was sufficient to take away al sinns in the world, and that by it once made we are made holy, and after it once donne Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. But what is this to the purpose. For we affirme not Christ to haue offered sacrifice at his last supper, because his sacrifice on the Crosse was not sufficient, or we not made holy by it: but because the scripture and fathers teach so, and Christ therby executed the function of his priesthood, accordinge to the order of Melchisedech, and applyed vnto his apostles the vertue of his bloody sacrifice, as he applyeth it vnto vs by the dayly sacrifice of the Masse: and

did

did not make perfect and consummate his bloody sacrifice, as Bel falsly chardgeth vs to thinke. As Bellarmin (whom onely I cite because Bel accounteth his testimony most sufficient) sheweth at lardge lib. 1. de Missa cap. 25. Wher also he answereth Bels arguments. But he should do wel to obiect the aforesaid wordes of S. Paul against Caluin blaspheminge lib. 1. instit. 16. num. 8. & 10. *That nothinge had been done for vs if Christ had only suffered corporal death, but we needed a greater, and more excellent price.* For this is plainly to say, that the oblation of Christs body once was not sufficient, nor that Christ perfected al by one oblation, which is expresly against S. Paule Hebr. 10. v. 10. 12. 14. And thus much for Bels second argument against the Masse. Caluin. 2. instit. c. 16. paragr. 10. *Hebr.*

6. The third is this, *The Eucharist is a testament. ergo either no sacrifice at al, or of no valew before the testators death because S. Paule Hebr. 9. v. 17. denieth a testament to be of force before the testators death. Answer.* The Antecedent we grant with S. Luke 22. v. 20. though Bel him selfe deny it soone after. The consequence we deny? for as the blood of calues, wher with the old testament was confirmed, was both the peoples sacrifice to God and his testament to them as appeareth Heb. 9. 20. and Exod. 24. v. 8. so Christs *Bel p. 24.* *Hebr.*

blood at his ſupper was both his ſacrifice to his father, and his teſtament to his apoſtles: And as a ſacrifice it tooke effecte immediatly, becauſe a ſacrifice is an abſolute gifte made to God, dependinge of no condition to come: as the ſacrifice of Abel and Noe pleaſed god immediatly. But as a teſtament it was not of force, til (as S. Paule ſaith) it was confirmed by death; becauſe a teſtament is a deed of gift, not abſolute, but vpõ condition that the giuers death enſue.

Gen. 4. & 8.

Hebr. 9. 7. 17.

11. Contradict.

7. Bel hauinge (as you haue heard) labored to proue the Euchariſt to be no ſacrifice, becauſe it is a teſtament, ſtrayght after inferreth thervpon, that it is not really Chriſts blood, becauſe it is not really a teſtament. *For* (ſaith he) *as Chriſt ſayd in S. Mathevv. This is my blood of the nevv teſtament: ſo he ſaid in S. Luke this cup is the nevv teſtament in my blood: But it is not really the nevv teſtament, becauſe remiſſion of ſinnes is referred to sheddinge of his blood, which was on the croſſe, not at ſupper.*

Bel pag. 25.

Math. 26. 7. 28.

Luc. 22. 7. 20.

Anſvver: The propoſition I grante, & deny the aſſumption: for not onely the laſt wil of the teſtator, but euen the authentical euidence thereof is properly called a teſtament. So we cal the Bible the teſtament, and Circumciſion is called a teſtament, Eccleſiaſt. 44. v. 21. and a couenant Gen. 17. And Chriſts blood is the authentical euidence

dence of his last wil, or els he made none.

8. And Bels reason maketh quite against him selfe. For Christs blood was shed at his supper for remission of sinns, as we proued before, and him selfe testifieth sayinge then in the present tense, *Which is shed for remission of sinns*, as the Euangelists both in Greeke and English bibles testifie. But because it was not shed or powred out then in a bloody manner, and proper forme, Bel wil not verefie Christs words in that tense wherin he spake them, not considering that euen then Christs blood being in a chalice in forme of wine, was in that forme powred out into the mouths of the Apostles for remission of their sinns; and his testament therby made, as the old was by the sprinkling of Calues blood vpon the Iewes: though the ratifying and confirmation therof, was afterward by his death.

Bel reasoneth against him selfe.

How Christs blood was powred out at the last supper.

Exod. 24. v. 8.

Hebr. 9. v. 20.

9 Bels fourth argument is out of S. Paul Heb. 10. v. 18. *ouc eti prosphora peri hamartias. There is not hence forth an oblatiō for sinne*, Some Catholiques answer that the Apostle meaneth an other oblation in substance, as the oblations of the Iewes were, who offered dayly different beastes, and the oblation of the Masse is in substance al one with the oblatiō of the Crosse. This Bel impugneth, *because then the Masse sacrifice should be of infinit*

Bel pag. 25.

vntruth 36. Valew, which no Papist dare auouch. Here is an vntruth for many learned Papists auouch it, as Caietan, Siluester, Canus, Ricard, Soto: and others, though they grant the effect therof to be finit, as the passion, and intercession of Christ are of infinit valewe, though the effect they worke be but finit, because *few are saued*. But others as Thomas, Scotus, Gabriel, Bellarmin: and deuines commonly deny Bels illation. for though the hoste offered in Masse be of infinit valew, yet the offeringe of it by men, is of finit valew. Because al mens actions haue that valew which God by his grace giueth to them, which is but finit. And Bel by the widdowes offeringe Luc. 21. might know that the valew of the offering is not alwayes correspondent to the valew of the thing offered. For rich mens giftes exceeded her 2. mytes, and yet their offering was inferior to hers. And much more inferior is mens offerings to the offering of Christ, though they offer the selfe same hoste.

Caiet. 3. part. q. 79 art. 5. Siluest. verbo Miss. q. 9. Can. 12. de locis. c. 13. ad 10. Ricard. art. 16. parag. 2. Soto 4. d. 14. q. 2. art. 2. S. Thom. 4. d. 45. q. 2. a. 4. Scot. quodl. 20. Gabriel lect. 26. in Con. Bellarm. l. 2. de Missa c. 4. Scholastici 4. d. 45.

10. But in deed the Apostle in the place cited by Bel, doth not so much deny an other oblation in substance, as an other ful and perfect partakinge of Christs oblation, teaching the Hebrues (as he had done before and as agayne in this Chapter v. 26.) that

that if after they haue bene baptized they returne agayne to the old lawe and Apoſtatate from Chriſt, they cannot haue the like aboundant remiſſion of ſinns applyed to them as was in baptiſme. And this he ment by thoſe words, *vvhere there is remiſsion of thoſe* (ſinns) *novv ther is not an oblation for ſinne*, which he vttereth more playnely v. 26. *If vve ſinn vvillingly after the knovvledg of the truth receaued, novv ther is not left an hoſte for ſinns, but a certaine terrible expectation of iudgment*. Becauſe God hauinge once pardoned by baptiſme both offence and punishment, afterward vſeth not the like mercy, but punisheth ſinne.

Bel pag. 26.

11. After this Bel turneth to his old cuſtome of iniuringe his Mayſter Bellarmin, chargeinge him with denial of the Maſſe to be truely and properly propitiatory, becauſe he ſaith, *that Chriſt being novv immortal can neither merit nor ſatisfie*. Wheras Bellarmin ſpendeth one whole chapter of that booke to proue Maſſe to be a propitiatory ſacrifice. And ſtrayght after thoſe wordes which Bel cyteth aproueth Maſſe to *be a ſatisfactory ſacrifice, becauſe by it, Chriſts paſsion accordinge to his inſtitution, is applyed to take away the temporal paynes of the liue and dead*. And by the wordes which Bel citeth, onely meaneth that Maſſe is not properly propitiatory as it proceedeth

Bellarm. l. 2. de Miſſa c. 4. cap. 2.

cap. 4. cit.

deth from any acte which Christ now hath, becauſe now he can neither merit nor ſatisfy. Wherefore falſly Bel doth accuſe. *Papiſts that with them Maſſe is one while a propitiatory ſacrifice and an other while not.* For the Tridentin Councel whom they al followe, hath defined it to be *truely a propitiatory ſacrifice*. And Bellarmin proueth it at lardge out of Scripture, Fathers, and Councells. See Origen hom. 13. in Leuitt. S. Chriſoſtom. lib. 6. de ſacerd. & hom. de prodit. Iudæ S. Auſtin q. 57. in Leuit. S. Beda lib. 4. Hiſt Chap. 22.

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ 22. c. 2. & can. 3. Bellarm. c. 2. cit.

Origen. to. 1. S. Chryſoſt. tom. 5. & tom. 3. S. Auguſtin. tom. 4.

Bel pag. 26.

12. His fift and laſt argument againſt Maſſe is taken out of the decree & gloſſe de conſecrat D. 2. Can. *Hoc eſt* thus tranſlated by Bel. *As therefore the heauenly bread, which is the fleſh of Chriſt, is after it manner cald the body of Chriſt, when in deed it is the Sacrament of Chriſts body, of that body which is viſible, which is palpable, mortal, & nayled on the croſſe. And that oblation of fleſh, which is made by the hands of the prieſt is called Chriſts death, and Crucifixion, and not in truth of the thinge, but in a miſtery ſignifyinge the thinge: ſo the Sacrament of faith by which baptiſme is vnderſtood is faith.* Hetherto the decre now the gloſſe therof: *The heauenly Sacramēt which repreſenteth Chriſts fleſh truely, is called the body of Chriſt, but improperly. Wherefore it is ſaid after is manner, but not in the*

in the truth of the thinge, but in the thing: ſignified that this may be the ſenſe, it is called Chriſts body (that is to ſay) it ſignifieth his body. Theſe (ſaith Bel) are golden wordes (as God would) by pens of Papiſts deliuered.

13. I accept his confeſſion. Firſt then S. Auſtin and S. Proſper are Papiſts, for (as Gratian out of whom the decree is take teſtifieth) the words of the Decree were firſt deliuered by S. Auſtins pen, and after recorded by S. Proſper. Secondly I hope Bel hereafter wil allowe of ſacrificinge or offering flesh by the hands of the prieſts, becauſe theſe are part of the golden wordes of that decree. For this ſo gentle confeſſion, I wil diſſemble with a litle fault of Bels tranſlatinge, *quod viſible quod palpabale mortale in cruce poſitum eſt.* Thus, *which is viſible palpable mortal & nayled on the croſſe.* Wheu he should haue ſaid, which being viſible palpable mortal was nailed on the croſſe. Now let vs heare what he gathereth out of the aforeſaid words *to the confuſion* (as he ſaith) *of Papiſts* but he should haue ſaid to his owne.

Gratian. de conſecrat. d. 2. can. Hoc eſt.

S. Auſtin and S. Proſper Papiſts.

Sacrificing of flesh by Prieſts hãds allowed by Bel.

2. Falſe tranſlat.

14. 1. *That the bleſſed bread of the Euchariſt is called the Body of Chriſt.* What is here againſt Papiſts? who willingly ſo cal it, but rather againſt Proteſtants who ſeldom or neuer cal it ſo. 2. *That it is alſo called the paſſion and death*

pag. 27.

37. verſo

death of Christ. This is an vntruth: for not bread of the Eucharist, but the sacrificing of flesh with Priests hands is so called. 3. *That it is not Christs body truely.* This is most true, for the bread or rather the forme therof, in the Eucharist, is not Christs body truely & properly 4. *That it is Christs body as the Sacrament of Baptisme is fayth.* This is nothing against vs, who confesse bread (or rather the forme therof, called bread because it so seemeth to sense) to be but a Sacrament of Christs body.

15. 5. *That it is not Christs body in truth but in signification.* This S. Austin saith not but onely that *the oblation of the flesh of Christ by the priest is his death and passion not truly but in a mistery signifyinge his death,* which maketh nothing against vs or to this purpose. The glosse in deede saith that *the Sacrament is not Christs body in truth, but in signification* and the same say al Chatholiques namely Bellarmin l. 1. de Eucha. c. 14. *The Sacrament of the Eucharist is not Christs body but containeth Christs body, for a Sacrament is a sensible signe,* and this sensible signe of bread and wine, is that which the glosse sayd is not in truth Christs body but is improperly so called: which is so far from being the vpshot of the controuersy, or not admitting any solution, (as Bel fondly boasteth) as in mans sight that hath

Bellarm.

Bel pag. 27.

hath eyes, it requireth no ſolution. For who wil thinke that one denieth Chriſts body to be truely in the Sacrament, becauſe he denieth the Sacrament (which is the ſenſible ſignes of bread and wine) to be truly his body? So Bel may gather that a body containeth not a ſoule, nor a place a body, becauſe the continents, are not the thing conteyned. *But* (ſaith Bel) *if Chriſts body were in the Sacramẽt really it ſhould be there in rei veritate truely.* As if the gloſſe had denyed that Chriſt is in the Sacrament in rei veritate. Suerly this sheweth that Bel neuer ment to deale *in rei veritate*. And thus much of the 2. member of this Article. Now let vs go to the third.

Chap. V.

Berengarius his Recantation explicated and S. Auſtins authority anſwered.

Popish *decrees* (ſaith Bel) *tel vs a long tale of one Berengarius ſome tyme Deacon of a church in Gaunt*. No maruail if this tale ſeeme long to Bel, which recounteth the foyle of his hereſie againſt the real preſence, in Berengarius the firſt brocher therof, in a general councel at Rome vnder Pope Nicholas the ſecond, aboute the year of Chriſt 1060. wher he recanted publikly and Bel pag. 28.

Berengar. condemned of 113. Biſhops.

Lanfranc. de Sacram. Euchariſt.

and (as him selfe saith) willingly, *denouncinge al such to deserue eternal curse, who denyed Christs body and blood to be really in the Eucharist.*

Bel lacketh latin.

Bel maketh him Deacon of Gaunt, wheras he was Archdeacon of Angiers in France, not being able to distinguish Andeauum from Gandauum Angiers from Gaunt; and becaus he abiured his heresie, Bel termeth him *a silly Deacon*, though his brother Buckly cal him *an excellent and holy man*. In deed he found more mercy at Gods hands then I read of any Arch-hereticke, and dyed a penitent Catholike. For dying on twelf day said (as Malmesbur. an English author at that tyme writeth.) *In this day of his apparition my lord Iesus Wil appeare to some, to glory as I hope for my repentance, or to punishment as I feare for others seduced.* The like repentance I pray God send to Bel ere he dye, that as he hath imytated Berengarius in heresie, and in abiuration also of it at Rome (if I be not deceaued) he may likewise imitate him in repentance and penance.

Bucleii answer to 8. reasons p. 62.

Malmesbur. l. 3. histor. Angl. in Gabriel. 1. p. 214.

2. But becaus Berengarius in his recantation, which was afterward put amongst the Decrees, professed *that Christ in the Eucharist sensualiter manibus sacerdotum tangitur, frangitur, & dentibus fidelium atteritur, is sensibly touched with hands of Priests, broken, and chewed with the teeth of the faithful*, Bel exclaymeth

Distinct. 2. cap.

mightely, calling his recantation (but yet without al proofe) *cruel, barbarous, villanous, blasphemous, and horrible impietie*. Gladly he would haue the reader beleeue, that Catholiques professe Christs body to be in it selfe broken, and torne in peeces one member from an other, though him selfe soone after not only alleadge Bellarmin to the contrary, but confesse also *that by the Popes doctrin Christs body can not be broken or torne truely, and in deed*, and cite the Glosse vpon the said decree saying, *that it were a worse heresie to thinke we made parts of Christ, then to deny him to be in the sacrament.* And this is euident by the Masse it selfe where we say, *Christ nether broken, nor deuided is receaued whole*, and *no cuttinge is of the thing, the breach is onely in the signe.* p. 29. pag. 30. Missa de corpore Christi.

3. Neuertheles Christs body is said to be toucht, broken, and chewed in the Eucharist, because the signe of bread in which it really is, is so vsed. As God is said to haue bene crucified, because the humanitie in which he was, was so handled, and Christ touched when his garment was touched. And these kind of speaches we learnd of the holy Fathers. For S. Chrisostom. speakinge of the sacrament saith expresly *that Christs body is broken*, In other place *we see, feel, eate, and haue Christ within vs.* Agayne S. Chrysost. hom. 24. in 1. Cor. 10. 4. *Hom.* 83. *in Math.* 10. 3.

Christ

Hom. 46. in Ier. to. 3. & 61. ad populum to. 5. Tertul. l. de Idolatria. *Christ gaue him selfe to vs to touch, to eate, and fasten our teeth* (marke Bel) *on his flesh.* Tertullian inueighinge against vnworthy receauers saith *Corpus Christi lacessunt.* They vex Christs body. S. Ciprian of the same affirmeth: *They vse violence to Christs body and blood and with their mouthes do offend him.* And they learnt these speeches of Christ him selfe saying: *This is my body which is broken.*

S. Ciprian. serm. de lapsis.

1. Cor. 11. v. 24. in the greeke. Wil Bel now condemne Christ and these holy fathers of wickednes, villany, blasphemy, and horrible impietie? Surely they vse the very wordes of touching, breaking,

Bel pag. 30. and fasteninge, or chewing with teeth. Nay wil he condemne both English, and many forrayne Protestants *whose constant doctrine* (saith he) *is that Christs body is broken torne & consumed with mouth and teeth.* Behold good reader. for Papists to say Christs body is touched, broken, and torne, is villany wickednes, blasphemy and horrible impiety: but for Protestants to say the same and adde consuming too, is good doctrine.

Bel admitteth Christs body to be consumed.

Bel pag. 29. 4. But Bel wil say that he addeth, that al these are to be vnderstood significantly and sacramentally. True. And the same adde wee. For as him selfe citeth out of Bellarmin lib. 2. de Concil. c. 8. *It is and al wayes was certayne that Christs body being now vncorruptible can be neither broken nor torne but in a*

Bellarm.

signe

ſigne or ſacrament. But the difference is in the vnderſtanding. For we ſay Chriſts body is broken in a ſigne, which really, and truely contayneth it; and Proteſtants ſay it is broken in a ſigne, from which Chriſt is as far as heauen is from earth, and to expreſſe this difference, and to exclude the ſenſe which Berengarius vſed, and the Proteſtants haue learnt of him, the Pope and Councel made him to profeſſe. That he beleeued this to be *in rei veritate* in the verity of the thing. Not as if Chriſts body weare in it ſelfe ſo handled, for therof there was neuer doubt, but that it was not handled ſo in a bare ſigne, but in ſuch a ſigne as in *rei veritate* truely contayneth Chriſts body. As the woman Luc. 8. did *in rei veritate* truely touch Chriſt when she touched his garment, in which he truely was: as appeareth by his words ib. v. 46. *Some body hath touched me:* But the Crucifiers, when they parted the ſame garments, did not touch him *in rei veritate* truely, becauſe then he was not truely in them. And hereby appeareth how the contrariety, which Bel noteth betwixt the Councel and Bellarmine, is none at al, and how proteſtants can not verifie the breakinge of Chriſts body, ſo wel as Catholiques can, and leaſt of al can (as Bel imagineth) verify Chriſts wordes of his body

Catholiques and Proteſtants agreement and difference about the breaking of Chriſts body.

S. Luke 8.

S. Ihon. 19. v. 23.

pag. 19.

giuen, & blood shed for remission of sinns, because neuer was any bare figure giuen or shed for remission of sinnes

pag. 30. 5, But a singuler note (saith Bel) and worthy to be marked, is gathered out of the glosse vpon the forsaid decree, when it aduiseth vs, *That vnles we vnderstand Berengarius words soundly, we may fal into worse heresie. Marke these words* (saith Bel) *for they teach vs playnly, that it is a most dangerous thing to rely vpon Popish decrees, euen then when they pretend to reforme the Church and condemne heresies.* But better may we saye marke this note, for it discouereth Bels malice, and folly, & teacheth vs plainly that it is a most dangerous thing to rely vpon heretikes, euen when they promise to auouch no vntruth

pag. 22. of any man, as Bel did a litle before. For what aduiseth the glosse, against the relying vpon Popes decrees, and not onely against misunderstanding them. May we not in like manner say of the scripture, that vnles we soundly vnderstand those wordes, Ihon 6. *except you eat the flesh of the sonne of man, and drinke his blood, you shal haue no life in you*, but grosly as the Capharnaits did of eating it sodde or rosted, or cut in peeces (as testify S. Ciprian and S. Austin) we shal fal into greater heresie, then that of Berengarius was. What now Syr Thomas? may we

Ciprian. de cœna Domini.
S. Augustin. tract. 27. in Ioh.

there-

therfore infer that it is a moſt dangerous thing to rely vpon ſcripture?

6. Finally Bel concludeth this third member of his article with an argument drawne out of S. Auſtins words: *Illi manducabant panem Dominum, illi panem Domini contra Dominum* They (the Apoſtles) eat the bread our lord, he (Iudas) eat the bread of our lord againſt our lord. Out of which wordes Bel frameth an argument ſo inuincible in his conceypt, as he promiſeth to ſubſcribe, and neuer more to write againſt any parte of Papiſts doctrine, if it be anſwered. Marke therfore I pray thee gentle reader his argument, and my anſwer, and iudge, whether he be not bound to turne his coate the third tyme, if he wil performe his promiſe. The argument he propoſeth out of forme, but it may be reduced to this. Iudas receaued but *Panem Domini* the bread of our lord, and not *Panem Dominum* the bread our lord: therfore in the Euchariſt is not *Dominus* our Lord. The Antecedent (ſaith he) *is playnly auouched by S. Auſtin*, the conſequence is cleere, becauſe if in the Euchariſt weare our lord, doubtles Iudas in receauing of it should haue receaued our lord. Before I anſwer this argument I muſt aduertiſe the reader of three things: firſt how ſlenderly this fellow is grounded in

Bel pag. 30. 31.

S. Auguſtin. tract. 59. in Ioan.

his faith, who promiſeth to ſubſcribe to the contrary, if one onely argument, grounded vpon one ſaying of one father can be ſolued. Euident it is that he hath neyther playne ſcripture, nor conuincent reaſon, nor the teſtimony of other fathers for his religion, who for anſwering of one fathers word, wil forſake it. Albeit this be les maruelous in Bel, becauſe hauing already twiſe altered his religion, he wil find les difficulty to change the third tyme. 2. I note the extreame blindnes of this fellow, who biddeth *vs note and marke ſeriouſly that S. Auſtin telleth vs, that the bread vvhich the Apoſtles eate vvas our lord.* I would Bel had marked this him ſelfe, for it is the very vpshot (to vſe his owne tearme) of this controuerſy, and vnanſwerable by any Proteſtant. For if (as Bel noteth out of S. Auſtin) the bread which the Apoſtles eate vvas our lord, how can proteſtants deny it, and ſay it was bare bread? Or if (as S. Auſt. ſpeaketh) they eate bread our lord, how can Bel ſay they eate not our lord, but bare bread? Can one eate flesh mutton, if the flesh he eate be no mutton?

Bel noteth a point quite against him ſelf.

7. Thirdly, I note his notorious abuſing S. Auſtins authority. For firſt in Engliſhing his words he addeth to them, though in a parentheſis, theſe words (*Not our lord but,*

Bels abuſing of S. Auſtins vvords.

but) afterward he saith S. Austin telleth vs, *that which Iudas receaued was but the bread of our lord*, then, as imboldened to lye, auoucheth that *S. Austin affirmeth most constantly, that Iudas receaued barely Panem Domini* bread of our lord, and lastly as cocke sure not to be tript in lying, professeth that *S. Austin playnly auoucheth that Iudas receaued not Panem Dominum bread our lord*. Wheras S. Austin saith no one of al these, but onely, that the Apostles receaued bread our lord, and Iudas bread of our lord, without *but* or *barely*, or denyal of the other. Marke therfore good reader his steps. First his vntruth is cogged into S. Austins words with a parenthesis, then is it put with a *but*, afterward with *barely*, and lastly playnly auouched. These steps might Bel haue found in his ladder of lying, better then he deuised the like before, in the Popes ladder to his supremacy. But here may the reader take a taste of the vntrue dealing of heretiques. For who would not haue sworne, but that Bel would haue dealt truely in an argument, wherof he counteth so much, as if it be solued, he wil recant the third tyme. But now to come to his argument.

vntruth 38.

vntruth 39.

vntruth 40

Bels steps of vntrue dealing.

1.
2.
3.
4.

8. I answer directly by denying the Antecedent. for S. Austin said not, that Iudas eate *but*, or *barely Panem Domini*, bread of

our lord, and much les ſaid he eate not *Panem Dominum*: but onely ſaid that the Apoſtles did eate *Panem Dominum* bread our lord, & he *Panem Domini* bread of our lord. Wherfore the doubt can be onely why he altered his ſpeech, calling that bread our lord, which the Apoſtles eate, and that bread of our lord which Iudas eate. The reaſon wherof can not be, becauſe he thought the Apoſtles and Iudas receaued a bread of different ſubſtance; for Epiſt. 162. he expreſly writeth that Iudas receaued *pretium noſtrum* our price which in ſubſtance is *Panis Dominus* bread our lord, and S. Chryſoſt. hom. de prodit. Iudæ affirmeth, that Chriſt offered to Iudas the blood, which he had ſold. and Theodoret. in 1. cap. 2. Cor. that he gaue to Iudas his precious body and blood. The reaſon therfore is that which S Auſt. him ſelfe inſinuateth in the words immediatly following *illi vitam, ille panam* they eate life, he punishment, vz becauſe the bread had a different effect, and operation in Iudas, then it had in the Apoſtles. For as him ſelfe proueth lib. 11. cont. Fauſt. cap. 7. one thing of different effects or operations may haue different names. What maruaile then if he called that which the Apoſtles receaued bread our lord, becauſe it was both in ſubſtance and operation food, and life

S. Auſtin ſaith Iudas eate our price. to. 2. S. Chryſoſt. tom. 3.

Buccella Dominica venenum fuit Iudæ. See S. Auſtin l. 2. cont. lit. Petil. c. 47. tom. 7. S. Auguſtin. tom 6. Corruptio, carni hoc nomen imponit Aug. l. 2. cont. aduerſ. legis. Et prophet. 9. 6. 10. 6.

life to them, and that which Iudas receaued bread of our lord, becauſe though in ſubſtance it was the ſame, yet through his malice, in operation it was poyſon and death vnto him And here by the way wold I propound one choiſe to Bel, whether he wil beleeue the Euchariſt to be *Panem Dominum* with Catholiques, or bare *Panem Domini* with Proteſtants. If the firſt, he may eate *Panem Dominum* with the Apoſtles, if the ſecond, he may eate *Panem Domini*, but it shalbe with Iudas. *A choiſe for Bel.*

9. But ſuppoſe S. Auſtin had ſaid (as he hath not) that Iudas did not eat bread our Lord, Bel could not therof infer that the Euchariſt is not truly our Lord, ſeing he auoucheth that the Apoſtles (who vndoubtedly receaued the Euchariſt) did eat bread our Lord: but at moſt, that what Iudas receaued, was not the Euchariſt; which diuers think, and it is a far different queſtion, and maketh nothing to this purpoſe: But nether could Bel infer this, becauſe S Auſtin other where affirmeth Iudas to haue receaued the Sacrament, and our price which in ſubſtance is bread, our Lord, and becauſe it is vſual to him to deny the name to a thing if it want the accuſtomed quality or operation. So lib. 11. cont. Fauſt. c. 7. he ſaith. In reſurrection there shal be no fl.sh, and

S. Hilar. can. 30. in Matth.

S. Auguſt. epiſt. 162 to. 2. tract. 26. & 61. in Ioan. tom. 9.

S. Auguſtin. tom. 6.

ſerm. 5. de verb. Apoſt. c. 12. There ſhalbe not the ſame body, becauſe it ſhal not be morral. Which kind of ſpeech he vſeth other where, and proueth it out of 1. Cor. 15. and 2. cor. 5. The moſt therfore that Bel can infer (and he may wel do it) is, that the bread which Iudas eate was not in operation our Lord, and life to him, but iudgment, and death: which I willingly graunt, but it maketh nothing for his purpoſe. Let now euery indifferēt Reader iudge whether this argument out of S. Auſtin be not ſufficiently anſwered, and Bel if he wilbe as good as his word, bound to recant yet once againe. And thus much of this member.

Chap. VI.

Bels imaginary contradictions in the Maſſe anſwered, and true Contradiction in his Communion shewed.

Bel pag. 32. THE fourth member Bel maketh of the apparent contradictions which are (as he ſaith) in the Maſſe. The firſt is that Catholiques ſay that Chriſts body is the ſame in the Maſſe which was on the croſſe, & yet confeſſe it to be a figure therof. Bellarm. l. 1. de Euchar. c. 6. This he proueth to be a contradiction becauſe a figure muſt needs be inferior to the thing figured as Bellarm: profeſſeth, and S. Paul

S. Paul teſtifieth. Anſwer. Firſt I deny al figures to be inferior to things figured: ſome be both figures & verity, as God the Sonne figure of the ſubſtance of his Father. Heb. 1. v. 3. and yet true God And Seth, an image of Adam Gen. 5. v. 3. and yet true man. And ſuch figures are equal to the things figured, and ſuch a figure of Chriſt is the Euchariſt; Others be bare figures, as images are of men, and the Sacraments and Sacrifices of the ould law were, wherof S. Paul and Bellarmin ſpake, and the Apoſtles Heb. 10. v. 1. calleth shadowes of goods to come. And theſe I graunt to be inferior to the things figured. But this maketh nothing againſt vs.

S. Paul. Hebr. 10.

What figures be inferior to the things figured what not.

2. Secondly I deny that to be ſuperior and inferior, is contradiction: for, as euery logician knoweth it is relatiue oppoſition, which may agree to the ſame thing in different reſpect. As the ſame ſoule as it is in the head, is locally ſuperior to it ſelfe, as it is in the foote; a man as he is learned, is inferior in valew to him ſelfe as he is vertuous: And a token as it is from a friend, more worth thē it is of it ſelfe. And hereby appeareth the error of Proteſtants inferring the Euchariſt not to be Chriſt, becauſe it is a figure or remembrance of him. For wel may one thing repreſent it ſelfe. As a King in a triumphant shew

Bel ignorant in logick.

One thing may figure or repreſent it ſelfe.

shew may represent, how he behaued him selfe in Battel. And Christs body and blood, as they are vnder the formes of bread and wyne, which are a sunder, represent them selues as they were a sunder in their proper formes on the crosse.

3. Thirdly I returne Bels argumẽt vpon him selfe. Figures must needs be inferior to things figured: Ergo the Eucharist is some nobler substance then bread. The Antecedent is his owne, the Consequence I proue, because the Paschal lambe was a figure of the Eucharist as S. Chrisostom S. Cyprian S. Hiero. S. Austin S Leo S Gregory & others affirme, and may be gathered out of S. Paul saying Heb. 10. v 1 That the law had a shadow of goods to come, and by Christs instituting the Eucharist immediatly after the eating of the Paschal lamb Whereby (saith S. Chrisostome) *in one table both Paschals of the figure and verity was celebrated.*

S. Ghrysost. hom. de prodit. Iudæ tom. 3.
S. Cyprian. l. de vnit. eccles.
S. Hieron in 26. Math.
S. August. l. 3. cont. literas Petilian. c. 57. to. 7.
S. Leo serm. 7. de Passione.
S. Gregor. hom. 22. in Euang.

4. His second, and third contradiction is of a greater body being conteyned in a lesse, and of Christs body broken, and not broken, which haue bene answered before. His fourth is, that *if Christs body be made present in the Eucharist by vertue of these words this is my body, either the body is there before the last words be pronounced, or no, if before? then the last is superfluous, if not? then either al the body is made*

pag. 32. Chap. 1. pag. 12. 13. Chap. 5. pag. 2. p. 33.

made by the last word, and so the three first stand for cypher, or parte of his body by one word, and parte by an other? and so Christs body is torne in peeces. O worthy challenger ignorant of the principles of logicke. What shew of contradiction is there here, though we should grant any one of the three points inferred? But this good fellow is more skilful in making contradictions, then in knowing what contradiction is. Bel ignorãt in logick.

5. Briefly I answer, that nether Christs whole body, nor any parte therof, is in the Eucharist before the pronounciation of the last word, yet are not the former words superfluous. For the last worketh the trãsmutation. not by his owne vertue alone, but with the vertue of them also, or rather God worketh al when the last word is pronounced. For (as S. Chrisostom saith) *It is not man that by the consecration of our Lords table, maketh the things proposed, the body and blood of Christ, but that Christ who was crucifyed for vs. The words are vttered by the Priests mouth, and consecrated by the power of God.* And the like answer must Bel make for diuers matters. S. Chrysost. homil. de prodit. Iudæ tom. 3.

6. For in baptisme one may aske whether a child be christened, before the name of the holy Ghost be pronounced, and then it is superfluous, and may be left out; or parte by the name of the father, parte by the

the name of the ſonne, and parte by the name of the holy Ghoſt, and then is the child chriſtened by peece meale: or onely by the name of the holy Ghoſt, and then the other twoe names are cyphers. And the like argument may be propounded in diuers other matters, but I wil propound it in a matter more intelligible, and perhaps more proportionate to Bels capacity out of his owne name *Thomas*. When one calleth him by that name, ether he is al called by *Tom*, and then *As* is ſuperfluous: or parte by *Tom*, and parte by *As*, and then is he called by peece meale: or al by *As*, & then is *Tom*: bnt a cypher, and *As* is al Bel, and ſo by conuerſion, al Bel is an *As*. Let Bel ſtudy to ſolue this argument, and I doubt not, but he wil finde the ſolution of his owne.

pag. 34. 7. The fifte contradiction which this contradictious fellow finderh in the Maſſe is, that Durand, Caietan, and foure Catholiques more, before the Councel of Trent did otherwiſe explicate the mannet of Chriſts real preſence in the Eucharift, then was truth, and ſince the Church hath defined, and explicated in the ſaid Councel. Is not this a goodly cõtradiction in the Maſſe? did Bel find al theſe mens opinions there, or rather gathered them out of Bellarmin, as he

Bellarm. l. 3. de Euchar. cap. 11. & 12.

as he hath done almost al his arguments? Or what maketh it against Masse, that three or foure Catholiques did in a difficult matter, before it was defyned and explicated by the Church, dissent from the rest? Let Bel if he can shew this diuersity now since the Councel. As for Protestants, Sainctes aboue 20. yeares agoe, gathered aboue 80. different opinions of theirs about these foure words, *This is my body*. And an other since hath collected twoe hundred. This far exceedeth the cõfusion of tonges at Babel, for there was but 72. tongues, but here be 80. yea 200. to expresse foure words. There one man kept one tongue, but here they alter speaking sometymes Lutherish, sometyme Zwinglianish, and otherwhyle Caluinish, and yet seing such horrible confusion, wil not giue ouer building of their Babilonian tower of heresy.

Lindan. Catalogo sacramentor. Sainctes de Euchar. Repent. 1. cap. vlt. 1577. ex Bellarm. lib. 1. de Euchar. c. 8. S. August. l. 16. de ciuit. c. 6. tom. 5.

8. The sixt contradiction is that when the Priest proposeth the B. Sacrament to the people, they must adore it, *albeit* (saith Bel) *if the Priest haue no intention to consecrate, or omit, or miscal any word of consecration it remayneth but bread, and the worshipers commit idolatry*. A ioly contradiction no doubt, do we think Bel wanted not his wits when he proposed such matter for contradictions? Catholiques thinke in deed that when the Priest

pag. 34.

vntruth 41

Prieſt wanteth both actual, and virtual intention, or omitteth any eſſential word, that there is no conſecration, and the Prieſt ſinneth therin greeuouſly; but the people worshiping erroniouſly vpon inuincible ignorance offend no more, then did S. Ihon when he worshiped an Angel as God, thinking (as ſaith S. Auſtin) it had bene God him ſelf, or as did Iacob, when he lay with *Lia* who was not his wife, thinking verely it had bene his wife *Rachel*. But to ſay that there is no conſecration when the Prieſt omitteth any word at al, or miſcalleth any words, ſo as the ſenſe be not altered thereby, is not Catholique doctrin, but Bels vſual falſe dealing.

Si conſcientia propterea laici nõ potuit quia neſciuit &c. Aug. lib. 2. cont. Creſcon. cap. 26. tõ. 7. *Apoc.* 22. v. 8. c. 19. v. 10. S Auguſt. q. 61. in Gen. to. 4. *Geneſ.* 29. v. 24.

pag. 34. 9. His laſt contradiction is, that *When many Prieſts are made together in Rome, they al pronounce the words of conſecration*. This is true but what then? *Papiſts* (ſaith he) *can not tel how many Gods, or how many times God is made in a peece of bread. O acculator fratrum*. Where dideſt thou heare of many Gods amongeſt Papiſts? Where of making of God? we ſay after S. Hierom and S. Pontian that Prieſts *conficiunt Corpus Chriſti* make Chriſts body, but dreame not of making God. Theſe be the ſlanders malitiouſly obiected to Catholikes againſt thine owne knowledge and Conſcience. But where is the

S. Hieron. epiſt. ad Heliodor. S. Pontian. epiſt. 1. Decretali.

the contradiction? Forsooth because *Innocentius holdeth that al such Priests do consecrate, Durand thinketh that he only who first pronounceth the words, and Caietan is of an other opinion.* I graunt these contradict one an other. But what is this to the Masse? are these contradictions in it? You promised to shew vs contradictions in the Masse, and twise you haue told vs of durand & Caietans contradictions, & as often of other matters, which had no shew of Contradiction. Besides that the matter in which these three Authors contradict one an other is no point of faith. For with Catholiques it is no more matter of faith, whether al the said Priests or one only consecrate, then it is with Protestants, whither al or one should christen a child, if many at once should dippe him into the font, & pronounce the words of Baptisme. So the letter be wel sealed, it skilleth not whither one or many be thought to make the print, when many together put their hands to the seale.

Bel deceiueth his Reader.

10. But if Bel when he looked vpon the Masse booke, had looked on his communion booke, and with the like eyes and affection, he should haue found other stuffe in it then he did in the Masse. For besyde that it is made out of our breuiary and Missal (wherupon Gilby called King Edward the sixt

Gilby admonition to England and Scotland. fol. 70.

the sixt his booke, an English mattins patched forth of the Popes Porteſſe) more then a thouſand Miniſters (whome the vniuerſity of Oxford acknowledged to be their brethren, and fellow laborers in the Lords haruest) in their petition exhibited to his Maiesty, say that they groan vnder a burden of humaine rites and ceremonies, finde enormities in their Church diſcipline, and in their Churches seruice, want of vniformity of doctrin, Popish opinions, and honor preſcribed to the name of Ieſus with diuers abuſes, which *they are able* (say they) *to shew not to be agreable to Scripture.* Thus Syr haue your owne miniſters deminished, the credit of your communion booke. And Reynolds (an excellent ornament saith Buckley) in the conference at Hampton court 1. proued the communion booke to contradict twiſe the Byble, & the Bishops were faine to amend it. 2. he argued it to contradict the 25. Article of their faith. 3. to conteyne manifeſt errors, directly repugnant to Scripture: 4. he requeſted it to be fitted to more encreaſe of piety. 5. profeſſeth that vrging men to ſubſcribe vnto it, is a great impeachment to a learned miniſtery, wherof he giueth diuers reaſons, as the repugnancy therin to Scripture, the corruption of Scripture, the interrogato-

Answer to the Petitio. Exhibited in April 1603.

A thouſand miniſters cenſure of the communion booke.

Answer to 8. reaſons. Conſer. p. 63. 86.

pag. 25.

pag. 59.

pag. 23.

pag. 58.

ries,

ries, and ceremonies in baptiſme, and certayne words in marrimony. Thus ſyr the excellent ornament of your Church hath adorned your communion booke, and this black verdict hath he giuen therof. D. Reinolds cenſure of the commonion booke.

11. And if I should but reckon the contradictions in Proteſtants doctrin about the Euchariſt, I shold neuer make an end, only I wil requite Bel with ſome few. 1. how Chriſts body (ſaith Willet) shold be verily preſent, and yet not really. Can there be *verum* and not *res*, or *ens*: *vere*, and not *realiter*? 2. how there can be a real preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament (as ſaith Perkins) and yet Chriſt no otherwiſe preſent, then a thing to it name. 3 How God giueth Chriſt in this Sacrament (ſaith the ſame Miniſter) as really and truly as any thing can be giuen to man, and yet he is giuen by only faith 4. How (as Caluin teacheth) the Euchariſt is no empty ſigne, but hath the verity of the thing vnited to it, and yet Chriſt is only in heauen. 5. How there is (ſaith Caluin) a true and ſubſtantial communication of Chriſts body, and blood in the Euchariſt, and yet Chriſt no more there, then he was in the Sacraments of the Iews, which were before his body was any ſubſtance. 6. How Chriſts body is truely really, and ſubſtancially in the Euchariſt (as Beza wrote in his

Proteſtants contradictiõs about their communion.

1. VVillet Treaſtyl. col. 2. part. 3. p. 82.

2. Perkins Reform. Cath. p. 185. 189.

3. Perkins ſup.

4. Caluin. 4. Inſtit. c. 17. paragr. 10.

5. Caluin. ſup. parag. 19. & 15.

6. Sainctes de Euchar repetit. 6. c. 1. p. 108. Mich. Fabrit. ep. de Beza.

confession exhibited to the Count Palatine and vttered publikly in the disputation at Poysi) and yet withal as far from the Eucharist, as heauen from earth; Surely such fellows as these haue *yea*, & *no*, in their religion, or els *walking in craftines adulterat* (as the Apostle speaketh) *Gods worde*. For if their words be vnderstood as they signify, & purport, they include manifest contradiction, and thus much of the second Article. *Wherfore be myndful* (Bel) *from whēce thou are fallen and do penance* Apoc. 2.

Surius An. 1556.

2. Cor. 1. 7. 17. 2. Cor. 4. 7. 2.

Apocal.

***

THE

THE THIRD ARTICLE OF THE POPES DISPENSATIONS.

CHAP. I.

BEL beginneth this Article as he did the two former with vntruthes, and dissimulatiõs. His vntruths appeare in that he chargeth S. Antonin, and Austin of Ancona, with teaching the Pope to haue equal powre with God. Becauſe S. Antonin writeth. *That seeing the Pope is Christs Vicar, none can lawfully withdraw himself from his obedience: And that Christ hath giuen him most ful powre, as S. Cyril* (saith he) *teacheth lib. thesaur.* which proofe out of S. Cyril this honest challenger left out. Austin of Ancona affirmeth: that *The Pope as Christs Vicar hath vniuersal iurisdiction ouer al Kingdoms and Empiers.* Did euer man see greater impudency, what word is here of equal powre with God? Nay expresse word of inequality, if vicars be vnequal to principals: deputies to Kings. Did Christs humanity when it receaued most ful powre. Math. 28. v. 18. and authority ouer al kingdoms, and bounds of the earth.

Bel pag. 36.

Antonin. 3. part. tit. 22. c. 5. parag. 8. *vntruth* 42 *vntruth* 43.

Augustin. de Ancona in summa p. 151.

S. Mathew.

Dauid. earth, psal. 2. v. 8. receaue equal powre to God? And if the powre of Christ as man (though neuer so ful, and vniuersal) were create, and vnequal to Gods powre, who can imagin the powre giuen by Christ as man to a pure man to be equal to Gods? I omit Bels error in affirming that Austin of Ancona dedicated his booke to Pope Ihon the twelft who was dead almost 400. years before him. But he shold haue said Ihon 22. and this error can not be laid vpon the Printer seeing the number is set downe not in cyphers but letters.

Ioan. 12. liued 956. August. de Ancona 1305. Onuph. in chron.

Dissimulatio 4. 2. His dissimulation is euident. First becausc he concealeth that the opinion (That matrimony only contracted may be vpon vrgent occasion dissolued) is held but of some Canonists, and of very few deuines, who commonly hold the contrary. But impugneth it, as if it were held of al Catholiques, and as a point of their faith. Secondly he imposeth the said opinion vpon Catholiques only, dissembling that Protestants think not only matrimony contracted, but also consummated by carnal copulation may be dissolued, & impugne Catholiques for not admitting any cause of dissoluing such matrimony.

Bel impugneth an opinion of Canonists and of Protestants as a matter of faith.

3. Dissimulation. Surius Ann. 1540. Vid. Lindan. l. de concordia Hæreticor. p. 69. 3. Luther the Protestants first Father writ a booke 1540. where he auoucheth it to be hard,

be hard, and vniust, that the innocent person may not marry an other after separation made for adultery. Caluin calleth it a most vniust law. Likwise Bucer in cap. 19. Math. Melancht. de loc. tit. de coniugio: Kemnitius in 2. part. exami. And Willet in name of English Protestants. Al these affirme that adultery is a iust cause why euen consummated marriage may be dissolued, and a new contracted. Luther addeth other causes as the one persuading the other to sinne: much debate betwene them: and long absence of the one party, which if it be done of malice seemeth iust cause to Willet, and therto he citeth Beza 1. Corinth. 7. and other Protestants. And this was practized in K. Edward 6. tyme, when Syr Ralf Sadler hauing maried one Mathew Baro his wife in his absence, though Baro had begotten children of her, yet could not recouer her, but by Parlament she was adiudged to Sadler. Caluin addeth want of consent of parents, if the parties be yong, and Bucer addeth incommodious behauior, of ether party to be a sufficient cause.

Caluin. 4. instit. c. 19. paragr. 37.

VVillet controu. 15. q. 2. p. 526. 527. 1.

Luther. in c. 7. ad Corinth. edit. 1523. 2. 3. 4.

VVillet sup.

Caluin. Bucer. sup. 5. 6.

4. Wherfore if the Pope by dissoluing contracted matrimony (which he doth very seldom, and vpon vrgent occasion, & weighty cause) challenge (as Bel saith) powre equal to God. Surely Protestants by

Bel pag. 37.

dissoluing consummated matrimony often, and vpon so many causes wherof some are very smale, and not sufficient to dissolue a meere ciuil contract, do challenge powre aboue God. But let vs see how he against some Catholiques, and generally al Protestants, proueth that contracted matrimony can not be dissolued, but by God alone for any cause whatsoeuer.

pag. 38. 5. His reason is because Christ said Math. c. 19. v. 6. *What God hath ioyned let not man seperate*, and Luc. 16. v. 18. *Euery one that putteth away his wife, and marieth an other committeth adultery*. And S. Paul 1. Corinth. c. 7. v. 10. *Those that are ioyned in matrimony command not I but our lord, that the wife depart not from the husband, but if she depart, abide vnmaried, or be reconciled to her husband*. To this the Canonists answer. That Christ and his Apostle spake only of consummated matrimony: because Math. 19. Christ forbiddeth seperation of such, as immediatly before he had said to be made one flesh, which is by consummation of matrimony. And likewise Luc. 16. prohibiteth mariage after dismission of a wife carnally known, as is gathered out of Math. 5. v. 32. where he vseth the same words, and citeth the law of diuorce Deut. 24. v. 1. which speaketh of a woman carnally known saying. *If a man haue taken a wife*

wife and had her, and she haue not found fauor in his eyes for some filthines, he shal &c. And hereby are answered the words of S. Paul, in which he referreth him self to the precept of Christ. Besids that S. Thecla virgin was by him *soluta à nuptys* losed from mariage as writeth S. Epiph. hær. 78. which S. Epiphan. fact S. Ambros. lib. 2. de virg. commendeth, and it argueth that the Apostle tought vnconsummated mariage might be dissolued. S. Ambros.

6. Against this answer Bel bringeth many replies in number, but none of force. 1. *That if contracted matrimony were not de iure diuino the greatest Popish Doctors vvold not deny the Popes dispensation therin.* Lo here when it maketh for his purpose, he confesseth the greatest Catholique Doctors to think contracted marrimony to be indissoluble. Why then doth he impugne the contrary as an Article of our faith? To his argument I answer, that though al Catholiques beleeue the institution of contracted matrimony to be of God, and Deuines for the most part probably thinke the continuance also therof to be *iure diuino*, and commanded by God: yet neuertheles Canonists do probably teach that the continuance of it is not absolutly, and in al cases commanded by God, but may vpon pag. 38.

great, and vrgent causes be dissolued by the Church.

7. Secondly he replyeth that *Christ speaketh absolutly, and maketh no mention of copulation or popish consummation.* Answer. Though in that verse he spake absolutly, yet immediatly before he made mention of copulation. And wil Bel forbid vs to expound a sentence of Scripture by the antecedents, or consequents? But I maruel much why he tearmed consummation, or copulation popish. Me thinketh he shold rather cal it Ministerish. For Papists can say with S. Austin lib. de bono coniug. c. 13. tom. 6. *We haue many brethren and companions of the heauenly inheritance of both sexes, who are continent, either after experience of mariage, or are free from al such copulation, such are innumerable.* But for Ministers their first father Luther imitating the beastly Valentinians, writeth that it is as necessary to haue a wife as to eat, drinke, or sleepe: and how wel ministers practice this doctrin let al England be iudge.

S. Austin see lib. 5 cont. Faust. c. 9.

Luther. lib. de vit. coniugali 1522. See S. Iren. lib. 1. c. 1. Raro hæreticus diligit castitatem. Hieron. in c. 7. Osee. *pag.* 38.

8. His third reply is that *Papists thinck matrimony contracted to be a Sacrament ergo* (saith he) *perfect before copulatiõ & indispensable by man. For as Canus saith: The holy Ghost and grace of Sacrament is not giuen by copulation.* Answer, graunting the Antecedent I deny the consequence. For though it haue the essence, yet

Canus lib. 8. de locis c. 5.

yet hath it not the perfection of the Sacrament before copulation. Because before, it signifyeth only the spiritual coniunction of Christ with a soule by grace, as S. Thomas, and Innoc. 3. teach, which as it may by man be dissolued, so also may matrimony before consummation; but after, it signifieth also the coniunction of Christ to the Church by flesh, which as man can not dissolue, so neither can he dissolue matrimony after consummation. And as a seal is the perfection of a bargain making it more hard to be broken then otherwise it shold be: so copulation is as it were the seal of the couenant of wedlock made betwixt man & woman, & maketh it more indissoluble then otherwise it should be.

S. Thom. 4. d. 27. q. 1. art. 3. q. 1. Innocent. 3. c. delictum de digamis.

9. As for Canus he meaneth of sinful copulation betwixt persons only affianced when *they* (saith he) *after spousals company together*. But as for coniugal copulation after matrimony is contracted, if it be done in that manner and for that end it should be, it giueth grace, and is meritorius, as appeareth by S. Austin l. de bon. coniug. c. 21. 22. tom. 6. where though he prefer the chastity of single life before the chastity of mariage, yet he compareth Abrahams merit in his holy vsage of mariage with S. Ihons merit in liuing single. Besides lawful copulation

See S. Austin l. 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 12. 13. 14. tom. 7.

is a

Artic. 5. p. 61. is a good worke as I hope Bel wil not deny, but according to his owne doctrin art 5. euery good worke is meritorius or impetratorius of Gods fauor, & reward. His fourth reply vz, that matrimony should not be fully perfected in the Church, if copulation do perfect it, containeth no new difficulty.

pag. 39. 10. Fiftly he argueth it to be absurd. That *matrimony beginneth to be a Sacramant by copulation, and was not by the Priests action.* But more absurd it is to vtter vntruths. For Catholiques say not that it beginneth to be a Sacrament by copulatiō, or by the Priests action: but that it beginneth by the mutual consent of the parties, and is perfected by their copulation, though that it be lawfully contracted, the Priests presence be requited. His sixt obiection is that *Matrimony was perfect in Paradise betwixt Adam and Eue.* But this is to assume that which he was to proue. His seuenth reply is: *If contracted matrimony were not de iure diuino both parties agreeing, they might dissolue it themselues, as they can dissolue spousals, because as the lavv saith euery one may yeeld vp his right.* Answer. Contracted matrimony is a Sacrament instituted by God, and therfore can not be dissolued but by such as succeeding the Apostles are dispensers of Gods misteries 1. Corinth. 4.

44 vntruth

See Bellar. l. 2. de Monachis. c. 38.

The contrary is a particuler opinion of Canus l. 8. de loc. c. 5.

Conc. Trid. sess. 24. c. 1. de Reform.

pag. 39.

S. Paul.

v. 1.

v. 1. The like reason is not of spousals, nor of any other contract instituted by man.

11. Eighthly he replyeth. That mariage betwene the B. virgin and Ioseph was perfect, where doubtles wanted copulation. That it was perfect he proueth because the angel called her Iosephs wife. And S. Ambrose saith. That *not defloweringe of virginity but coniugal couenant maketh wedlock.* And S. Austin writeth. That *we rightly vnderstand Ioseph to be maries husband, by very copulation of wedlock without commixtion of flesh.* Againe. *God forbid that the bond of wedloock (rumpatur) be broken betwixt them, who are content vpon mutual consent, to abstein for euer from vse of carnal concupiscence. For it was not falsly said of the Angel vnto Ioseph, Fear not to take thy wife mary.* Answer: Al these proofs conuince no more, then that contracted matrimony is true mariage, as we willingly confesse was betwixt Ioseph and our B. Lady, For the Angel calleth her not Iosephs perfect, wife, but absolutly his wife. Wherupon S. Hierom l. contr. Heluid. saith *s. Ioseph was rather a keeper, then a husband,* and in c. 1. Math. *When thou hearest an husband do not suspect mariage, but remember the custome of Scripture that spouses are called husbands, and sponsesses wises.* And S. Basil hom. de human. Christ. gener. calleth that dispousation wherwith S. Ioseph, and

Math. 1.

S. Ambros. de institut. virg. ca. 6. tom. 1.

S. August. l. 2. de consens. Euang. c. 1. tom. 4.

Lib. 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 11. to. 7.

S. Hierom. pr. fin.

S. Basil.

and our Lady were maried, *beginning of Mariage.* As for S. Ambrose he denyeth not that deflowring perfecteth mariage, but that it maketh it. And S. Austin in the first place affirmeth that we truly vnderstand Ioseph to be Maries husband without copulation, but addeth not that he is so perfectly.

12. To the secõd place I answer that S. Austin speaketh there only of cõsummated mariage, both becaus his intention in those books was as he professeth in the beginning to shew against the Pelagians. That though childrẽ infected with original sinne do proceed from mariage, it selfe is no sinne, which difficulty hath no place but in cõsummated mariage. As also becaus after he had proued in the forsaid 11. chapter that the bond of wedlock is not broken by purpose of absteining from vse (as he speaketh) of concupiscence, or exercise of marigeable acts, in the next chapter he concludeth thus. *Wherfore then may not they remain man and wife, who of consent leaue of companying together, if Ioseph and mary remayned man, and wife, who not so much as began to company together.* By which Conclusion of his, it is euident that before he had spoken only of consummated mariage, and only meant to proue that it is not broken by priuate determination, or purpose of the parties to absteine from exercise of co-

Lib. 1. c. 1.

Cap. 22.

of copulation. Which he proued by an argument *a fortiori*, becauſe vnconſummated matrimony of our B. Lady, and Ioſeph was not broken by their purpoſe of abſteining from al carnal knowledge. But whither vnconſummated matrimony which is not broken by ſuch priuate purpoſes of the parties maried, may vpon iuſt and vrgent cauſe be diſſolued by the Churches authority S. Auſtin there ſaith no word at al.

13. Finally Bel concludeth this Article with an egregious ſlaunder of the Pope, and falſe dealing with S. Antonin. For he auoucheth that *P. Martin 5. diſpenſed with one who had contracted, and conſummated matrimony with his owne natural, and ful ſiſter of the ſame father, and mother.* This he proueth out of S. Antonin: ſaying: *That P. Martin diſpenſed with one who had contracted, and conſummated matrimony cum quadam eius germana.* Here Bel maketh a ful point and addeth no more. But S. Antonin addeth *quam cognouerat Fornicarie*, with a ſiſter of hers, with whom he had committed fornication. And before the words cited by Bel he ſaith that *ſeeing affinity is contracted by fornication, as by coniugal act, he that hath committed fornication with any vvoman can not marry cum filia eius, vel germana eius, vvith her daughter, or her ſiſter.* And affirmeth that Paludan thinketh the Pope can not diſ-

Bel pag. 40. 45. vntruth

Antonin. 3. part. tit. 1. c. 11.

diſpenſe in this matter, yet (ſaith he) *Martin 5. diſpenſed with one who had contracted, and conſummated cum quadam eius germana quam cognouerat fornicarie, with a certain ſiſter of hers with whom he had committed fornication:* What now more euident then that S. Antonin ſpeaketh not of a man marying his owne ſiſter, but his harlots ſiſter? wherin though the Pope (as he ſaith) made great difficulty, yet perhaps Proteſtants wold make ſmale, or no ſcruple at al. Behould therfore gentle Reader not the excellency of holy Popery (as Bel ſcornfully exclameth) but excellency of wholy miniſtery which hath as Iſay ſaid of ſome *made lying their hope.* Is this M. Bel your promiſe, pag. 22. of auouching no vntruth vpon any man? Is this the ſincerity you make shew of pag. 5. and 221? Is this your proteſtation made in your preface *to yeeld if any can conuince you to haue alleadged any writer corruptly, quoted any place guilfully, or charged any author falſly.* Let now the Reader be iudge by this your dealing with S. Antonin whether you be not bound to recant the third tyme. *Be mindful therfore* (Bel) *from whence thou art fallen, and do penance:* Apocal. 2.

Iſai. c. 28. v. 15.

Bel bound to recant the 3 tyme

Apocalip.

THE

THE FOVRTH ARTICLE OF ORIGINAL CONCVPISCENCE IN THE REGENERATE.

CHAP. I.

The Catholique doctrin touching concupiscence explicated and proued.

BECAVSE Bel in this Article doth after his accustomed manner, proceed confusedly, and deceitfully, before I answer his obiections I wil particulerly by Conclusions set downe the Catholique doctrin vpon this matter, wherby the Reader may clearly see, both what Catholiques defend, and what Bel ought to impugne. Supposing therfore a distinction of Concupiscence, which Bel him self vseth pag. 49. into Habitual, which is the proneſſe, and inclination in the inferior portion, or powers of our corrupt nature vnto disorderly actions, and Actual, which is the disordinate Acts them selfs.

2. The first conclusion, is: That habitual

See S. Tho. 2. d. 30. q. 1. art. 3. S. Thomas. Bellarmin. tual cõcupiſcence in men not yet regenerat is materially original ſinne. This teacheth S. Thomas 1. 2. q. 82. ar. 3. and Bellarmin l. 5. de amiſſ. grat c. 5 (whoſe teſtimony I the oftener, & more willingly vſe, becauſe Bel p. 125. Bel accounteth it *moſt ſufficient in al Popish aſſaires*) and the Proteſtants deny it not, and I proue it. Becauſe as original iuſtice did formally conſiſt in the conuerſion of the wil to God, and did materially connotate the due ſubiection of the inferior powers: So original ſinne doth formally cõſiſt in the auerſion of the wil from God, & materially connotateth the rebellion of the ſayd powers. And becauſe concupiſcence is thus materially original ſinne S. Auſt. ſomtymes calleth it original ſinne, and ſaith it is remitted in baptiſme, when the guilt of Adams ſinne annexed vnto it (which maketh Cap. 1. pag. 2. it formally ſinne) is taken from it, as hereafter ſhalbe shewed.

3. Second concluſion: Habitual concupiſcence euen in the regenerate is euil: This S. Thomas. teach S. Thomas 3. p q. 15. ar. 1. and q. 27. ar. 3. Bellarmin l. de grat. primi. hom. c. 7. and l. 5 de amiſſ grat. c. 10. and al Catholiques. And the contrary is Pelagianiſme, as S. Auſtin. is euident out of S. Auſtin l. 6. cont. Iulian. c. 5. l. 5. c. 3. tom. 7. and l. 1 de nupt. & concupiſ. c. 35. And the Concluſion is manifeſt, becauſe

becauſe Habitual concupiſcence includeth not only prones to euil, but alſo difficulty to do good, and want of habitual order in the inferior powers, and therfore is both poſitiue, and priuatiue euil. Hereupon S. Paul Rom. v. 7. 18. calleth concupiſcence in him ſelfe *not good*. And v. 21. *euil*: and v. 16. he ſaith that he hateth it. And S. Auſtin lib. 6. cont. Iulian c. 15. ſaid: *Who is ſo impudent, or mad, as to graunt ſinne to be euil, and to deny concupiſcence of ſinne to be euil.* And becauſe concupiſcence allureth to euil, it is ſomtyme called of the Apoſtle *Sinne, lavv of ſinne*. Rom. 7. of Deuines *fomes peccati*: *the fomet of ſinne, and tyrant*, of S. Auſtin *iniquity* ſerm. 12. de verb. Apoſt. c. 5. *Vice*. l. 2. cont. Iulian. c. 3. to. 7. *Vitious*, and *culpable*. l. de perfec. iuſtit. c. 6. S. Ambroſe de apolog. Dauid c. 13. *Root and ſeminary of ſinne*. And becauſe it cauſeth difficulty to do good, it is otherwhile called of S. Auſtin. l. 6. contr. Iulian. c. 19. 1. Retract. c. 15. ſerm. 12. de verb. Apoſt. l. de continent. c. 4. & others *languor, ſicknes, defect*: *infirmity*. As becauſe it is in our inferior portion it is called of the Apoſtle. Rom 7. v. 23. *lavv of our members*, and of others, *lavv of the flesh*. And finally becauſe it is inflicted vpon vs for Adams ſinne: S. Auſtin. 1. Retract. c. 15. calleth it *punishment of ſinne*, and alſo *Sinne* becauſe it

Habitual Concupiſcence both poſitiue & priuatiue euil.

S. Paul.

S. Auſtin ſee him lib. 2. de nupt. & concup. c. 9.

S. Ambroſe tom. 3.

S. Auſtin. tom. 7.

S. Augustin. to. 7. is the effect therof l. 1. contr. duas epist. Pelag. c. 13. and l. de spirit. & lit. c. vltimo tom. 3.

4, Third conclusion: Actual concupiscence though inuoluntary, is euil. This teach al Catholiques with Bellarmin loc. cit. against the Pelagians, and it is manifest by S. Paul Rom. 7. v. 19. *The euil which I wil not, that I do*: by S. Austin lib. 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 27. and 29. and l. 6. cont. Iulian. c. 16. l. 5. c. 3. in psal 118. conc. 8 and otherwhere often, and by the reason which he giueth l. 5. cont. Iulian c. 3. because it is a disordinate act contrary to the rule of reason: Hereupon men are ashamed of it; and S. Austin lib. 2. cont. Iulian. c. 5. and lib. 6. c. 19. calleth it *iniquity*: and lib. 1. de nupt. & concupisc. cap. 27. *filthy and vnlawful.*

S. Augustin. to. 7. Tom. 8.

More required to formal sinne then to euil.

Hence Bel pag. 53. inferreth inuoluntary concupiscence to be formal, and proper sinne, but he is far deceaued. For formal sinne beside euil, and vnlawfulnes requireth voluntarines, as I shal hereafter proue, and is euident in fooles, and beasts, who though they haue these inuoluntary acts are no formal sinners.

5. Fourth Conclusion: whensoeuer it is any way voluntary either in it self, or in any needles cause therof, it is formally sinne. This is euident: because then it hath the

the whole eſſence or definition of ſinne: for it is a voluntary act againſt Gods law, or right reaſon. I ſay needles cauſe, becauſe if the cauſe be neceſſary, or honeſt, it excuſeth the actual concupiſcence following therof from fault.

6. Fift Concluſion: Habitual, and actual Concupiſcence whatſoeuer, euen in the regenerate may be called ſinne. This is manifeſt out of that which hath bene ſaid in the 2. and 3. concluſion. For ether it is voluntary, and then it is formal ſinne, & properly ſo called: or though it be vnvoluntary, it is the cauſe, effect, punishment, or material part of ſinne: and any of theſe reaſons ſuffice to make it figuratiuely be called ſinne. And they al are taken out of S. Auſtin. For 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 23 he ſaith Concupiſcence may be called ſinne, becauſe it is the effect of ſinne, as writing is called a hand. And in the ſame place becauſe it is the cauſe of ſinne: as coldnes is called ſluggish becauſe it maketh ſluggish. Likwiſe 1. Retract. c. 15. he calleth it ſinne, becauſe it is the punishment therof. So Zachar. vlt. v. 19. punishment of ſinne is called ſinne. And finally lib. 5. cont. Iulian. c. 3. he calleth actual concupiſcence ſinne, becauſe it is a diſorderly act; and it wanteth nothing of ſinne, but voluntarines, and

All Concupiſcence may be called ſinne & why.

1.

2.

3.

4.

therfore may as wel be called ſinne as a dead body is called a man. And who wel remembreth what is ſaid in theſe fiue Concluſions, need no more to anſwer al Bels arguments. For, as we ſhal ſee, he proueth no more then they containe.

Actual Cõcupiſcence if inuoluntary is no formal ſinne.

7. Sixt Concluſion: Actual concupiſcence whenſoeuer it is inuoluntary is no formal or proper ſinne, or offence to God. This is againſt Bel in this whole Article. But I proue it. Firſt becauſe ſome acts of Concupiſcence be but temptatiõs to ſinne, and are before ſinne be brought forth. Ergo ſuch are no formal ſinne. The conſequence is euident. For what is but tentation to ſinne, and goeth before ſinne be, is no proper ſinne. The Antecedent I proue out of S. Iames ſaying *Euery one is tempted by his Concupiſcence*, behold an act, but a tempting of vs to ſinne: *afterward when concupiſcence hath conceaued it bringeth forth ſinne*, behold alſo an act of Concupiſcence going before ſinne be brought forth. Willet ſaith nothing to the firſt part of tentation, but to the ſecond of bringing forth he anſwereth. *That it followeth not Concupiſcence to be no ſinne, becauſe it bringeth forth ſinne, becauſe one viper may bring forth an other.* But we infer not Concupiſcence to be no ſinne, becauſe it bringeth forth ſinne: for we wel know that one ſinne

S. Iames c. 1.v.14.15. See S. Auſtin lib. 6. cont. Iul. cap. 15. to. 7.

Willet controuerſ. 17. q.1.p.558.

ſinne may bring forth an other: but we gather that that act of Cōcupiſcence, which S. Iames tearmeth *conceauing of ſinne*, is no ſinne, becauſe he affirmeth it to go before the bringing forth of ſinne, in ſaying *Afterward when Concupiſcence hath conceaued it bringeth forth ſinne*, and this could not be, if it were ſinne, it ſelf. Caluin anſwereth this argument otherwaies, whom Bellarmin confuteth. Caluin.lib.3. inſtit.c.3.paragr.13. Bellarm.l.5. de amiſſ. grat. & ſtat. peccat.c.7.

8. Secondly becauſe whiles a man with the minde ſerueth the law of God he can not by ſinne ſerue the dyuel. But S. Paul euen when he had inuoluntary motions of concupiſcence, ſerued with the minde the law of God. Therfore then he ſinned not. The Propoſition is euident by the ſaying of Chriſt. *None can* (at once) *ſerue two maſters.* The aſſumption S. Paul teſtifieth Roman. 7. v. 25. ſaying, *I my ſelf with the minde ſerue the law of God, but with the flesh the law of ſinne.* S. Math. 6. v. 24. S. Paul.

9. Thirdly nothing inuoluntary, or done againſt our wil is ſinne, diuers acts of Concupiſcence be ſuch. Ergo no ſinne. Bel wold gladly (as ſome of his fellowes do) deny the propoſition, and therfore ſtreight after he had propounded the argument, telleth vs (though falſly) that S. Auſtin proueth inuoluntary motions to be ſinne in- Bel pag.50. Perkins reſor. Cath. tit. *Of original ſinne.*

deed, and towards the end of this Article
pag. 57. auoucheth *a man to be guilty of sinne in that which he doth against his vvil, and can not auoid,*
pag. 51. yet at last resolueth rather to deny the Assumption: wherfore I proue them both: The proposition I proue out of that very
S. Augustin. to. 1. place of S. Austin, which Bel citeth to the contrary. *Sin* (saith he 1. Retract. c. 13.) *is so far forth voluntary euil, as it is no vvay sinne, if it be not voluntary. And this* (saith he lib. de vera relig. c. 14.) *is so manifest, as nether the fevvnes, of learned, nor the multitude of vnlearned doth deny it.* And wil Bel now deny that which in S. Austins tyme nether learned,
46. vntruth nor vnlearned would deny? Now let the Reader iudge, with what face Bel affirmed that S. Austin in the foresaid place 1. Retract. proueth inuoluntary Concupiscence to be sinne, where he most manifestly affirmeth nothing to be any way sinne if it be not voluntary, and therupon laboreth to shew original sinne in infants to be some
S. Augustin. lib. de duab. animab. c. 12. tom. 6. & 1. Retract. c. 13. to. 1. way voluntary. And in an other place he auoucheth it *to be high iniustice, and madnes, that a man shold be guilty of sinne, because he did not that which he could not do* And S. Hierom.
S. Hierom. epist. ad Damas. de exposit. fid. Accurseth *their blasphemy who say that God hath commanded any impossible thing,* as no doubt he hath, if we sinne in that which we can not auoid:

See

See him dialog. cont. Pelag. S. Chriſoſtom hom. 13 ad Rom. Proſper de vita contempl. c. 4. S. Auſtin ſerm. 61. de temp. de nat. & grat. c. 69. in pſal 56. and others. By reaſon alſo it is manifeſt. For if inuoluntary acts done againſt our wil be true ſins, much more the acts of fooles, and mad men, yea of beaſts, which are not done againſt wil, but only without wil, and they true malefactors, and ſinners before God and men, which I think none, but a madde man, wil graunt. And I doubt not but Bel would think him ſelf vniuſtly executed, if he were put to death for a thing done againſt his wil, and which he labored al he could to hinder.

S. Chryſoſt. tom. 4. S. Proſper. S. Auguſtin. tom. 10. Tom. 7.

10. The Aſſumption I proue, becauſe if that be not inuoluntary, wherof we giue no occaſion, nor conſent vnto, yea deteſt and hinder al we can, (as it hapneth oftentymes in the motions of Concupiſcence,) I can not ſee what can be inuoluntary vnto vs. And if they be Papiſts, (as Bel tearmeth them pag. 51.) who cal ſuch acts of Concupiſcence inuoluntary. A Papiſt is S. Paul ſaying, Rom. 7. v. 19. *I do the euil which I will not.* And S. Auſtin when he ſaith. *I will not that Cõcupiſcence couet. We wold ther were no Cõcupiſcences, but wil we, nil we, we haue them.* Yea Bel him ſelf no les then they, thrice in

If Concupiſcence be not ſome tymes inuoluntary nothing is inuoluntary.

S. Paul. S. Auguſtin. ſerm. 43. de verb. Dom. See ſerm 3. 5. and 11. de verb. Apoſt. *Bel a Papiſt by his own iudgment.*

this Article pag. 50. 51. and 57. in plaine termes calleth these motions inuoluntary.

Bel pag. 51.

11. But to this argument he answereth. *That they be voluntary in their origin*, and therto citeth S. Austin affirming original sinne of infants to be voluntary in their origin, and calleth this the Gordion knot which Papists can neuer vntie, and so clear and euident a solution of the argument, as euery child may behold the weaknes, falshood, and absurditie therof. But Bel is ignorant what it is to be voluntary in the origen. For this is nothing els but to be willed of him, from whom we took our origin, and whose wil is accounted ours. As original sinne is voluntary to infants in their origin, because it was willed of Adam in the eating of the forbidden Aple, and his wil was in that fact accounted theirs. And this ment S. Austin loc. cit. But as for actual motions of concupiscence, he neuer said they were voluntaty to vs in their origin; nether can they both because Adam had no wil of cõmitting these acts, as he had of leesing original iustice in eating the Aple; as also because his wil was not accounted ours in any other act, then in his keeping, or first leesing of original iustice. Besides as S. Gregory writeth l. 15. moral. c. 22. *Original sinne being blotted out, children are not held by the iniquity of parents,*

S. Austin 1. retract. c. 13. tom. 1.

What is to be voluntary in the origen.

1. Retract. c. 13. to. 1.

Why inuoluntary motions are not voluntary in their origen.

S. Gregory.

parents,

parents, and therfore Adams wil, can not make thoſe acts in the regenerate to be ſinne, which of their nature are none.

12. And thoughthe forſaid motiõs were voluntary in their origen, yet couldthey be nether, original, nor actual ſinne. Not original, becauſe they are acts, and not common alike to al: Nor actual, becauſe they haue no actual wil of the doer, and as voluntary in general is eſſential to ſinne in general, ſo is actual voluntary, to actual ſinne. Yea for an act now done to be formal ſinne when it is done, ſufficeth not, that it was actually voluntary in the cauſe done long ago, if now it be againſt wil. For albeit when I gaue cauſe of an vnlawful effect, which I did ſee wold after enſue, I was guilty of the effect, when I did the cauſe: yet if after the cauſe done I repent & be ſory before the effect follow, I do not ſinne a new in the effect. As if by ſome thing yeſterday done, I gaue occaſiõ that diſordinate motiõs riſe to day, though I was then guilty of theſe motions riſing, yet if I ſince repented I do not ſinne a new when they riſe now againſt my wil. Els I ſhould againſt my wil leeſe that grace which I got by repentance. Wherfore wel wrote S. Gregory to S. Auſtin our Apoſtle. *Oftentymes it is done without fault which cõmeth of faults.* And much les ſhould inuoluntary

Inuoluntary motions, though they were voluntary in their origen could be no ſinne.

S. Gregor. epiſt. ad Auguſtin. Cant. c. 10.

luntary motions be sinnes in vs, though they were originally voluntary vnto vs only by the wil of an other. Thus is this Gordion knot two waies vntyed. But him selfe hath with his tong tyed so fast a knot for proofe of my conclusion, as with his teeth he wil not be able to loose. For pag. 48. he affirmeth *S. Paul to haue bene most free, and innocent touching actual* sinne, and he proueth it, *because he fought mightily against his raging concupiscence, and did in no wise yeeld therunto*: which is both to confesse that S. Paul had inuoluntary motions of the flesh, which him selfe acknowledgeth Rom. 7. v. 15 17. 19. 23. & yet to proue them to be no sinne in him, because they were inuoluntary, which is both my conclusion, and reason.

Bel disproueth him selfe.

12. *Contradict.*

13. As for S. Austin he is so far from thinking that we sinne by inuoluntary motions of the flesh, as he saith epist: 200. ad Asellicum: *That if We consent not to them We need not say: Forgiue Vs our trespasses*: which he repeateth againe l. de spir. & lit. c. vlt. adding *that if We cõsented not to these acts We should disproue that saying of S. Ihon: If vve say vve haue no sinne vve deceaue our selfs*, and proueth it l. 1. de ciuit. c. 15. thus. *If concupiscential disobedience be vvithout fault in the body of one sleeping, hovv much more in the body of one not consenting.* And l. 1. de nupt. & concupis. c. 23. explicateth

S. Augustin. to. 2. See S Austin lib. 2 cont. Iul. c. 3. & 10. lib. 5. c. 3. 15.

Tom. 3.

Tom. 5.

teth how it is called ſinne vz: *as vvriting is called a hand, or cold ſluggish vvhich* is figuratiuely, & improperly. Nay he not only excuſeth vs from ſinne, when we conſent not vnto inuoluntary motions of the flesh, but auoucheth that then *we do much good, a great matter, for vvhich vve shal be crovvned*: lib. 1. de nupt. & concupiſc. c. 29. *He doth much good vvho doth that vvhich is vvritten. Follovv not thy luſts.* And ſerm. 5. de verb. Apoſt. c. 6. *It is a great matter for me not to be ouercome* of concupiſcence, and cap. 9. who conſenteth not *doth much, it is a great matter he doth.* And lib. 2. de Gen. cont. Manich. c. 14. *Somtyme reaſon doth manfully refraine and bridle Concupiſcence euen ſtirred vp vvhich vvhen it is done vve fal not into ſinne* (mark Bel) *but vvith ſome ſtriuing are crovvned.* Wherfore if they be Papiſts (as Bel ſaith pag. 46. and 49.) who ſay we merit when we reſiſt Concupiſcence, ſurely S. Auſtin is one. Yea Bel himſelf if he account it a good deed (as I hope he wil) to reſiſt luſt: for art. 5. pag. 61. he graunteth *al good deeds to be meritorious* S. Gregory alſo epiſt. ad Auguſt. c. 11. teacheth, *That pollution in ſleep is not at al to be feared vvhen it proceedeth of ſuperfluity, or vveaknes of nature,* And lib. 21. moral. c. 3. *Vnclean cogitation defyleth not the mynde when it beateth, but vvhen it ſubdueth the mind vnto it by delight.* More Fathers I might adde but

Merit in reſiſting Concupiſcence according to S Auſtin.

Tom. 7. Tom. 10.

Tom. 1.

Contradict. 13.

S. Gregory.

Caluin. but it were needles, because Caluin lib. 3. instit. c. 3. paragr. 10. confesseth that *al the Fathers before S. Austin are of the same opinion with S. Austin.*

14. Seauenth Conclusion: habitual Concupiscēce in the regenerate is no proper, or formal sinne. This euidently followeth out of the former. For if the acts be not formal sinne, but by consent of wil, much les the proanes vnto them: but it may be proued also otherwaies. First because if it be any sinne, it is original (for actual it can not be, being no act) but original it is not, because by regeneration, *we put of the old man*: Coloss. 3. v. 9. or lay away the old man Ephes. 4. versic. 22. and *put on the new*: Coloss. 3. v. 9. and Ephes. 4. v. 24. And by keeping original sinne we keep on the old man as by first contracting it we put him on. But it is contradiction at the same tyme to keep on, and put of or lay away the old man. Ergo in our regeneration we keep not original sinne. And this is confirmed: because by sinne we bear the image of the earthly man, by regeneration the image of the heauenly according to that 1. Corinth. 15. v. 49. *As we haue borne the image of the earthly* (man) *let vs bear also the image of the heauenly.* But 2. Cor. 6. 7. 15. these two images be opposit. For *what agreement with Christ and Belial.* Therfore we

can

can not haue damnable sinne, as original sinne is, and be regenerate.

15. Secondly in regeneration either we remaine guilty of damnable sinne, or become guiltles of al such sinne. If we remaine guilty, then is not our sinne forgiuen: contrary to that article of our Creed. *Forgiuenes of sinnes.* For it is impossible to be guilty of sinne, and to haue sinne forgiuen. Then remaine we also guilty of damnation *the stypend of sinne*, Rom. 6. v. 23. For the guilt of punishment riseth of the guilt of sinne, as necessarily as fatherhood riseth of begetting a child. Wel may God chuse whether he wil punish a malefactor, or no, yet he can not make, that a malefactor remaining a malefactor, and guilty of sinne, shal not be guilty also of punishment. But a iustified or regenerate man can not be guilty of damnation; because *There is no damnation to them who are in Christ Iesu*: Rom. 8. v. 1. And Bel pag. 45. confesseth *That a man can not be iustly condemned for sinne remitted*. If in regeneration we become guiltles of al damnable sinne, then haue we no such sinne in vs. For as S. Austin saith, *To be not guilty of sinne is to haue no sinne*: And again: *Sinnes remaine but by their guilt.* As adultery once committed remaineth in the Committer, only because he is stil guilty of the adultery he did, vntil it be

Symbol. Apost.

Vbicunque peccatum est illic se profert ira & vltio Dei. Caluin. 3. instit. c. 11. pag. 2.

S. Paul.

Bel.

S. Augustin. l. 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 26. to. 7.

it be remitted.

Perkins refor. Cathol. pag. 36. See S. Austin lib. 6. cont. Iulian. c. 6.

16. Protestants answer. *That by regeneration guilt is taken from vs, but not from the sinne which is in vs.* But this is contradiction: for if the guilt be in the sinne, & the sinne stil in vs the guilt is also stil in vs. Beside the guilt of sinne (wherof we speak, and not of the guilt of punishmēt) can not be in our sinne, which can not be guilty of it selfe, but in vs only, who are guilty of sinne, which we haue cōmitted. And the remaining of sinne in vs consisteth only in the remaining of this guilt (as saith S. Austin) as the remaining of adultery cōsisteth only in this that a man is stil guilty of the adulterous fact he did. And therfore if this guilt of the fact be taken frō him, it is impossible for adultery to remaine in him. Beside it is manifest contradiction to say one hath sinne in him, and yet is not guilty of sinne, or a sinner, as it is to say the ayer hath darknes in it, and yet is not darke.

S. Augustin. 2. de nupt.

What it is for sinne to remayne.

17. Thirdly God in regeneration *taketh away sinnes*: Ioan. 1. v. 29. Miche. 7. *casteth them into the depth of the sea*: Seperateth *from vs as far as the East is from the west*: psal. 102. But concupiscence is not taken away, it is not cast into the depth of the sea, nor separated from vs as far, as the East from the west. Ergo it is no sinne. Againe: By justifica-

S. Ihon. Micheas 7. 19. Psalm. 7. 12.

fication he maketh vs *more white then snow*: psal. 50. v. 9. but how can we be whiter then snow, if the blacknes of sinne stil remaine in vs? Fourthly Adam by his sinne depriued of grace, and transfused sinne into al them that are generate of him. Ergo: Christ by his merit expelled sinne, and transfused grace into al them that ate regenerat of him. The Antecedēt is euident. The consequēce I proue. For els Christs merits had not bene so potent and effectual to do good, as Adams sinne was to do euil, seeing Christs merit can not as really, and truly take sinne from vs, as Adams sinne transfused it into vs. Which is both contrary to Christs honor, and to the Apostles doctrin Rom. 5. v. 17. 18 19. Fiftly *how shal one be iustly condemned for that which is remitted in baptisme? it can not be.* Ergo after baptisme there remayneth no damnable sinne. The Antecedent is the very words of Bel pag. 44. and 45. and agreable to S. Paul Rom. 8. v. 1. *There is no damnation to them, that are in Christ Iesus.* The consequence is euident for one that hath damnable sinne may be iustly condemned.

S. Paul. Bel disproued by himself.

18. I need not cite Fathers for proofe of this Conclusion because as I said before Caluin confesseth that *S. Austin had faithfully, and very diligently gathered the sentences of al holy Fathers*, and yet disagreeth from him.

Caluin. lib. 3. instit. c. 3. pag. 10.

For

For S. Austin (saith he) *dare not cal concupiscence sinne, but is content to tearme it infirmity.* Let now any indifferent Reader iudge whither we haue not reason to boast (to vse Bels tearms) that S. Austin is on our side. And no maruel. For 1. de nupt. & concupis. c. 23. he writeth thus: *Truly this same Concupiscence is now no sinne* (mark Bel) *in the regenerat when consent is not giuen vnto it to vnlawful acts.* And soone after. *But in a certain kind of speech it is called sinne: and* he giueth there two reasons of this figuratiue speech, *because* (saith he) *it was made of sinne, and maketh sinne if it ouercome.* Again: *So is* (Concupiscence) *called sinne, because it was made by sinne, whereas now in the regenerate it selfe is no sinne* (mark again) *as speech which the tong maketh is called a tong, & writing a hand which a hand maketh. So also it is called a sinne, because it maketh sinne if it ouercome as cold is called sluggish, because it maketh sluggards.* Can any Catholique now speak more plainly. In these few words al in one chapter, he twise denyeth concupiscence in the regenerate to be sinne, once affirmeth it to be improperly so called, and giueth two reasons, and two examples of such figuratiue speech: The same doctrin he teacheth l. 1. contr. duas epist. Pelag. c. 13. and l. 2. cont. Iuhan. & in al his tomes as Bellarmin sheweth. So that

S. Augustin. to. 7.

S. Augustin. to. 7. Bellarm. l. 5. de amiss. Grat. & stat. peccati c. 8.

what-

whatsoeuer Bel hereafter shal obiect out of S. Paul: S. Austin, or others calling concupiscence sinne, I need not answer my selfe, but referre the Reader to these words of S. Austin, wherin he explicateth both why, and how, S. Paul, him selfe, and others meane not properly, but improperly and figuratiuely, when they cal concupiscence sinne. Yet becaus Bels arguments containe diuers vntruths requisite to be taxed, I wil answer them al in such order as he proposeth them.

S. Austin hath preuented al Bels obiections.

Chap. II.

Diuers vntruthes of Bel disproued, his arguments out of S. Paul against the doctrin in the former chapter answvered.

Bel beginneth this Article as he did the rest with vntruths 1. *That S. Paul in the whole 7. chapter to the Romans proueth original concupiscence in the regenerate to be sinne.* This is not so: for he doth not proue it to be any sinne at al, but supposing it to prouoke to sinne, calleth it sinne. 2. *That Papists can not abide the Apostles doctrin.* Forsooth becaus we can not abide Bels exposition. 3. *That the cause of our denying Concupiscence to be sinne is becaus it ouerthroweth our holy so supposed*

Bel pag. 41.
vntruth 47
vntruth 48
vntruth 49

Bel blasphemeth iustification.

posed iustification (thus blasphemously he denyeth iustification to be holy) *our inherent puri-ties, condigne merits, & works of supererogation.* This is vntrue: for it might be such sinne, as Bel wold haue it (to wit venial) and destroy none of al these. But the true causes are Scriptures, Fathers, & reason before alleadged, and Bel confesseth that the reason which we euer haue in our mouth is the inuoluntarines of concupiscence 4. *That the Maister of Sentences vtterly condemneth vs in calling concupiscence culpam.* But he meaneth improperly as is euident by his owne words 2. dist. 32. *Concupiscence after baptisme* (saith he) *is only* (mark Bel) *punishment of sinne, but before baptisme both punishment, and fault.*

Bel art. 6. p. 81.

pag. 50.

vntruth 50 3. sent. d. 19.

Bel pag. 42.

2. Thus hauing made his way with vntruths, he proueth cõcupiscence to be sinne out of S. Paul Rom. 7. v. 25. saying. *I my selfe with the mynd serue the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sinne.* And hence noteth *that the regenerate do serue the law of sinne.* But he forgot to note that it is but with the flesh, and that *with the mynd* (without which there is no formal sinne) *they serue the law of God.* He also noteth. *That the best liuers can not merit grace, and glory ex condigno: because by sinne they deserue death. Which because S. Austin* (saith he) *at the first could not digest, he vnderstood S. Paul in the 7. chapter to the Romans, only*

Ibid.

51. vntruth

of the

of the vvicked, not of the godly. But remitting the matter of merit, and deſert of ſinne to their proper places art. 5. and 6. falſe it is that S. Auſtin changed his opinion about the vnderſtanding of thoſe words of S. Paul Rom. 7. *I am a carnal man ſolde vnder ſinne*: and the like, becauſe he ſaw that iuſt men ſinned. For as him ſelfe teſtifyeth 1. Retract. c. 23. (and Bel wrongly cited 22.) he reading other expoſitors, found that the foreſaid words might be vnderſtood of the Apoſtle him ſelfe, as the word *carnal* may be verifyed of him in reſpect of his body, not yet ſpiritual, and the word *ſinne* in reſpect of concupiſcence, which is ſinne vz: improperly, as the ſame S. Auſtin explicateth in the books to which he referreth vs, and we cited them before. Wherby we ſee, that S. Auſtins error was in vnderſtanding the foreſaid words of formal, and proper ſinne (as Bel doth) and corrected it by vnderſtanding them of improper ſinne. And yet euen when he was in that error, he was ſo far from thinking (as Bel doth) that the beſt liuers in rigor deſerue eternel death, that then he wold in no wiſe thinke the Apoſtle to ſpeak of a mā in grace, aſſuring him ſelfe, that no ſuch man is ſolde vnder ſinne that deſerueth eternal death.

Bel forgetteth his matter.

S. Auſtin.

Lib. 1. de nupt & concupiſc. c. 23. & l. 1. cont. duas epiſt. Pelag. c. 13.

3. His ſecond proofe is out of the 23. verſe *Bel pag. 42.*

verse of the same chapter where S. Paul writeth *I see a lavv in my members subduing me to the lavv of sinne. VVhat* (saith Bel) *can he merit who is prisoner to the lavv of sinne.* But beside that, Bel forgot what he was to proue: vz. Concupiscence in the iust to be sinne, not their merit to be none: S. Paul by the word (*me*) vnderstandeth only his flesh, as he had expounded him selfe before v. 18. when he said. *There dvvelleth not in me that is in my flesh good.* And S. Austin interpreteth 1. de nupt & concupis. c. 30. and 31. And v. 23. saith that *he vvas prisoner to the lavv of sinne in his flesh, and in his mynd serued the lavv of God:* what maruel then, that one prisoner in flesh, but free in mynd (from which al our merit, or sinne proceedeth) may by seruing Gods law, merit.

Bel forgetteth vvhat he is to proue.

Bel pag. 43.

False translat. 3.

4. His third proofe is out of the 19. verse where (as he citeth) S. Paul saith. *The vvil vvhich I vvold not that I do.* Omitting the false translating of *ou thelo* and *Nolo*: *I vvold not*: as though S. Paul had not had a present, and absolute wil not to lust, but an imperfect velleity which euen the wicked haue, and in english we signify by *vvold, and vvold not.* I answer that S. Paul improperly saith; He doth that which he wil not, and therfore in the very next verse, as it were correcting that speech saith. *If I do that I vvil not, I vvorke it not*

7 20.

it not, wherin he both affirmeth & proueth that we do not what we wil not. And the reaſon is euident. For as the commonwelth is principally the Prince, Peeres, and Magiſtrats, which gouerne the reſt: ſo a man is principally his wil, which commandeth the reſt. And therfore as the cõmonwealth doth not that, which they do not, though ſome of the commonalty do it: ſo a man doth not, what his wil doth not, though ſome of his inferior powres do it. If therfore S. Paul did but improperly ſay, he doth what he wil not, Bel can therof inferre but improper ſinne. Beſides though it were a proper ſpeech, therof can be inferred no proper ſinne, for want of voluntarines. And here by the way Bel ſtraweth his flowers of leaſing, ſaying. *That the cauſe why S. Auſtin epiſt: 105. vvrote that God crovvned nothing but his ovvne gifts, vvhen he crovvneth our merits, is, becauſe the regenerate by inuoluntary acts of Concupiſcence ſinne, and become guilty of damnation.* For nether doth S. Auſtin ſpeake there of inuoluntary acts, nether any where doth he ſay they exclude merit, or deſerue damnation, yea plainly auoucheth *that vve are crovvned vvhen vve haue them againſt our vvil.* And the true cauſe of his ſpeech shal be giuen in the next Article of merit, and his very words conuince that our merits

A man rather doth not then doth vvhat his vvil doth not. See S. Thomas 1. 2. q. 74. art. 3. ad 3.

Bel pag. 43.

51. *vntruth*

S. Augaſt. 2. de Ceneſ. cõtr. Manich. c. 14. tom. 1.

Why merits are no sinne, out of S. Austin.

are no sinnes, and much les deserue damnation: for he calleth them Gods owne gifts and saith he crowneth them: but God nether giueth nor crowneth sinne.

pag. 43. Cap. 1. parag. 3.4.6.13.18.

5. Fourthly Bel alleadged the Apostle calling Concupiscence sinne: Rom. 7. v. 14. and 20. But this we answered before. Bel

53. *vntruth*

replyeth that *it will not suffice to say with Bellarmin that it is called sinne only because it prouoketh*

54. *vntruth*

to sinne, as a mans writing is called his hand, because it is written with his hand. Here be two vntruths fathered vpon Bellarmin. For nether doth he say Concupiscence is called sinne only because it prouoketh to sinne:

Bellarm.

yea lib. 5. de amiss. grat. & stat. pec. c. 8. he giueth an other reason out of S. Austin, because it is the effect of sinne. Nether doth he say that it may be called sinne, because it prouoketh to sinne, as writing is called a hand, because it is made by a hand; for so it is a cause, and writing an effect; but as cold is called sluggish, because it maketh sluggards. But let vs hear why S. Paul may not

Bel *pag.* 43.

be vnderstood of improper sinne. First *because the Maister of Sentences graunted Concupiscence to be sinne.* This is twise sod colworts set again before his reader for want of other meat, but reiected before. Secondly because

Sup. parag. 1.

it maketh a man to serue the law of sinne, which seruice can neuer be but sinne. Here the question

it self

it self is begged. For the question it self is, whither the seruice to the law of sinne done by the flesh not by the mynd (as S. Paul speaketh Rom. 7. vers. 23.) be proper sinne, or no, and that Bel beggeth of vs to graunt. But he must win it, ere he get it. And though we did graūt it to him, yet could he no more infer therof that habitual Concupiscence, which causeth it, is sinne, then he can infer the powre of our wil, which is a gift of God, to be sinne, when it causeth sinne. Thirdly (saith Bel) *because the euil wherof S. Paul speaketh he hateth and wil not* (Bel hath wold not) *do it*, which must needs be meant of sinne. True, but of material, and improper sinne. For such also is to be hated, and not to be willed. *Bel assumeth what he was to proue, and yet concludeth nothing.*

6. Bel hauing thus silly proued his heresy out of S. Paul, endeuoreth to proue it out of our doctrin thus. *Al reprobates are reprobated both negatiuely, and positiuely for original sinne. Ergo: Concupiscence is sinne euen after baptisme. The Antecedent* (saith he) *is a maine point, and settled ground of Papists religion, and he willingly graunteth it.* The consequence he proueth because *some reprobates are baptized.* Answer. First I deny the Antecedent. For nether doth any Catholique affirme it to be any point at al of Popish faith, & much lesse a maine point, or ground therof: nether *Bel pag. 43. 44.* *vntruth 55.* *1. Answer*

(though some beleeue it as a schoool opinion) is it true, because original sinne being as truly forgiuen in baptisme to many reprobates, as it is to predestinates, they can be no more positiuely sent to hel for it, then predestinates. For as S. Paul saith Rom. 11. v. 29. *Gods gifts are without repentance*, so that what sinne he truly forgiueth he neuer afterward punisheth in hel. wherfore S. Prosper writeth that *who goeth from Christ, and endeth this life out of grace, what goeth he but into perdition? yet he falleth not againe into that which is forgiuen, nor shalbe damned in original sinne.* Only as al sinns are sayd to returne by ingratitude, according to the parable of the vngrateful seruant Math. 18. because a sinne, after others haue bene pardoned, becometh greater by the ingratitude, then otherwise it were: so original sinne pardoned to some reprobats in baptisme, may be said to returne to them through their ingratitude in sinning after the said pardon, and they being positiuely damned for such sinne, may in some sort be said to be positiuely damned for original sinne. Secōdly though the Antecedent were true, it could not follow therof, that Concupiscence in reprobates is formal sinne, but only that original sinne is not truly forgiuen in baptisme to any reprobat, which though it be false, pertaineth

S. Paul.

S. Prosper in resp. ad obiect. 2. Gallor.

How reprobats may be sayd to be reprobated for original sinne.

2. *Answer*

teineth not to this queſtion. For as for habitual Concupiſcence, it nether before baptiſme, nor after is formal ſinne, but before only materially ſinne, and after only languor, and weaknes as is before explicated. But how Bel admitting al reprobates to be reprobated poſitiuely for ſinne, agreeth with his Maiſters Caluin, Beza, and others teaching that they are reprobated for Gods pleaſure, and that he made them to damne, and reprobate them, let his breethren in the lord enquire. Now to his places taken out of S. Auſtin, whom he promiſeth to ſhew to be ſo plaine for his doctrin, as none can ſtand in doubt therof. But who wel remembreth S. Auſtins words, and Caluins confeſſion before cited, can neuer ſtand in doubt but that Bel moſt braggeth wher he hath leſt cauſe, and like a prating petty-fogger cryeth lowdeſt, when he hath leſt proofs.

Cap. 1. parag. 2. & 3.

Caluin, Beza Rom. 9.

Bel contradicteth his fellow Miniſters.

Bel pag. 45.

Chap. 1. parag. 13. & 18.

CHAP. III.

Bels arguments out of S. Auſtin touching Concupiſcence anſwered.

THE firſt place he alleadgeth out of S. Auſtin is tom. 7. l. 6. contr. Iulian. c. 3. where he writeth. As blindnes of hart is ſinne, punishment of ſinne, and cauſe of ſinne. So cõcupiſcence of the fleſh is ſinne, punish-

Bel pag. 45.

punishment, and cauſe of ſinne. Anſwer. S. Auſtin compareth concupiſcence with blindnes of hart, in the material diſorder of ſinne. For as ſinne is againſt the rule of reaſon, ſo diſordinate luſt, not in formality of ſinne. Nether ſay I this only, but can proue it. And omitting that other where he plainly auoucheth it to be no formal ſinne, as is before shewed, I proue it, firſt by his reaſon, where with he proueth it to be ſinne: vz becauſe *it is diſobedient to the rule of reaſon*, which conuinceth it to be material ſinne, and a diſorderly and euil thing, but not to be formally ſinne, for want of voluntarines, which him ſelfe neceſſarily requireth to formal ſinne as is before shewed. Secondly becauſe it ſufficed to S. Auſtin to proue concupiſcence to be material ſinne, for to diſproue Iulian the Pelagian againſt whom he there diſputed, who taught, as S. Auſtin there and other where teſtifyeth, that it was laudable & good, againſt whom he there proueth by the example of blindnes of hart, that it was not only punishment and cauſe of ſinne, but alſo ſinne; that is, naught, euil, and diſorderly; becauſe it is againſt the rule of reaſon, which is to be ſinne materially, though it want the forme of ſinne which is voluntarines.

Lib. de Spir. & lit. c. vlt. l. 1. de nupt. & concup. c. 23. l. 1. con. duas epiſt. Pelag. c. 13.

Cap. 1. parag. 9.

Lib. de nupt. & concup. c. 34. to. 7. & l. 6. cont. Iul. c. 17.

2. Next he bringeth theſe words. *Some iniquity*

Bel pag. 46.

iniquity is in man when the inferior parts do ſtubbernly ſtriue againſt the ſuperior, albeit they be not ſuffered to ouercome. And quoteth for them l. 6. contr. Iulian c. 8. as he found it through the Printers error, falſly quoted in Bellarm: but they are, l. 6. c. 19 which added to that, that almoſt al he ſaith is found in Bellarmin, conuinceth that he made this boaſting challenge out of his obiections. As for S. Auſtin his meaning when he calleth concupiſcēce iniquity is ſufficiently explicated before. And the very word, *Some*, argueth that he thinketh it not to be formal ſinne, but in ſome ſort vz: materially. Beſides that him ſelfe l. 2. contr. Iulian c. 5. expoundeth the like words out of S. Ambroſe of no ſinful iniquity.

S. Auguſtin. tom. 7.

Bellarm. l. 3. de amiſſ. grat. & ſtat. pec. c. 9.

& els chalēg nothing but Bellarmins obiections. Sup. c. 1. parag. 3. & 4.

3. The third place cited by Bel is l. 1. de nupt. & concupiſ. c. 25. where S. Auſtin writeth. *If* (concupiſcence) *can both be in the baptized parent and be no ſinne, vvhy is the ſelſe ſame no ſinne in the child? To this I anſvver* (ſaith S. Auſtin) That *concupiſcence is not ſo forgiuen in baptiſme, that it is no more, but that it is no more imputed to ſinne.* Item. *There remaineth not any thing vvhich is not remitted.* Wherupon Bel inferreth both that concupiſcence is formal ſinne, els it need not be forgiuen, & that it is true ſinne, as wel after baptiſme, as before though it be not imputed to ſinne after baptiſme,

pag. 46.

S. Auguſtin. tom. 7.

tiſme, and biddeth vs mark that S. Auſtin ſaid not: *Nothing is ſinne that remaineth*, or *no ſinne remaineth*: but *not any thing remaineth vvhich is not remitted.* Anſwer. The forme, & eſſence of habitual ſinne is the guilt of actual ſinne before done, according to S. Auſtin in the ſame book, and next chapter, as the forme of habitual ſinne of adultery is the guilt of actual adultery before committed: & the forme of that habitual ſinne which we haue by origin, is the guilt of Adams actual eating the Aple, which guilt being annexed to Concupiſcence maketh it formal ſinne, and to require forgiuenes, but that guilt being taken away by Gods forgiuing the ſinne (as the ſame holy Doctor teacheth in the ſame place, and lib. 6. contr. Iulian. c. 17. and lib. 1. Retract. c. 13) Concupiſcence need no more forgiuenes (as the ſame B. Saint writeth. lib. de ſpirit. & lit. c. vlt. and epiſt. 200.) Nor remaineth any more true ſinne, more then the body remaineth a man after the ſoule is departed. And in this very place which Bel citeth, when he asketh why Concupiſcence is ſinne in the childe, if it be in the parent baptized, and be no ſinne in him, euidently ſuppoſeth that it is no true ſinne in the baptized.

VVhat is the eſſence of habitual ſinne.

Cap. 26.

How Concupiſcence needeth for giuenes.

S. Auſtin.

To 3. & 1. & lib. 1. contr. duas epiſt. Pelag. c. 13.

4. As for that of not imputing ſinne, what

what S. Auſtin meant therby we wil rather learne of himſelf then of Bel, he therfore in the very words which Bel citeth hauing asked *why Concupiſcence is not ſinne* (mark Bel) *in the parent baptiZed as wel as in the childe vnbaptiZed*, anſwered that *by baptiſme non imputatur in peccatum* it is not imputed for ſinne. In which anſwer vnles he did by not imputing for ſinne, meane making no ſinne, he had not anſwered the queſtion, why Concupiſcence was no ſinne in the baptized parent. Therfore with him Concupiſcence not to be imputed to, or for ſinne, is to be made no ſinne. And cap. 32. he ſaith that *Concupiſcence to be imputed, is to haue the guilt* (vz of Adams actual ſinne) *which it hath, with it*: and conſequently to be not imputed is to haue this guilt taken away, but to haue no guilt is to haue no ſinne, as him ſelf ſaith c. 26. therfore with him Concupiſcence to be not imputed is to be made no ſinne. Nether indeed can God otherwiſe not impute ſinne but by taking it away. For *his iudgment is according to truth.* Rom. 2. v. 2. and therfore if ther be ſinne in vs, he muſt needs impute it to vs, and account vs ſinners, els he ſhold not accoũt vs, as we are, and according to truth. And albeit S. Auſtin did not in this place ſay in plaine tearms. *Nothing is ſinne that remaineth.*

What not imputing of ſinne is with S. Auſtin.

None but an infidel will ſay ſinne is not taken away in baptiſme S. Auguſt. l. 1. cont. duas epiſt. Pelag. c. 13. to. 7.

S. Paul.

or: *No*

or: *No sinne remaineth* yet he manifestly supposed the first, when he asked *why concupiscence is not sinne* (mark Bel) *as wel in parents baptized as in the child*, & affirmed them both in equiualent tearms when he answered that by not imputation concupiscence became no sinne in the baptized, as is already shewed. And otherwhere plainly affirmeth. *That al sinnes are forgiuen* (in baptisme) *and nowe are no more at al.* What is this but to say no sinne remaineth. And nothing more vsual with him then to say. That *in baptisme al sinnes are taken away, do dye, are wholy forgiuen, al iniquity blotted out: the baptized haue no sinne. Infants christened haue no filth.* Beside in sense al is one to say. Nothing remaineth which is sinne: and nothing is sinne that remaineth. For God by remitting taketh away the guilt of sinne, as S. Austin saith l. 1. de nupt. & concupis. c. 26. l. 6. contr. Iulian. c. 17. and l. 1. Retract c. 13. which guilt is the very forme of sinne as is before explicated out of S. Austin.

S. Austin l. 1. contr. duas epist. Pelag. c. 13. In Psal. 72. l. 6. cont. Inl. c. 16. 17. Tract. 41. in Ioan. serm. 6. de verb. Apost. lib. 20. de ciuit. c. 26.

Bel pag. 47. S. Augustin. 20. 7.

5. The fourth place is taken out of S. Austin l. 1. de nupt. & concupis. c. 29. *He doth much good who doth that which is written. Follow not thy lust, but perfecteth it not because he fulfilleth not that thou shalt not couet, or lust.* Hence Bel inferreth. First *that the iust can do no good, nor striue against lust so perfectly but it is*

annexed

annexed to ſinne. This is grounded vpon S. Auſtins words of not perfecting good, and not fulfilling the law of not coueting. But the illation is quite contrary to his meaning in this place and others before cited, where he ſaith. *That as long, as we conſent not, we ſinne not, we need not aske forgiuenes, yea do much good and are crowned.* And though he ſay we perfect not our good, yet not to perfect is not to ſinne, eſpecially when it is againſt our wil that we perfect it not, as it is in this caſe. And S. Auſtin is ſo far from ſaying here we ſinne when we perfect not this worke, as he affirmeth that we do much good. And Bel can as wel combine good and ſinne in one act, as he can annex light and darknes, heauen and hel, God and diuil. For as the Philoſopher ſaith *bonum ex integra cauſa, malum ex quolibet defectu.* It is no good act vnles it be good euery way, and it is ſinne if it be euil any way.

Epiſt. 100. l. de Spir. & lit. c. vlt. l. 1. de nupt. & concupiſ. c. 29. lib. 2. de Gen. contr. Manich. cap. 14.

Non eſt culpæ deputandum ſi non dum poteſt eſſe tanta dilectio Dei quanta plenæ perfectæque cognitioni debetur. Aug. de ſpir. & lit. c. vlt. tom. 3.

Ariſtotel. Quæ participatio iuſtitiæ cum iniquitate. 2. Cor. 6.

6. As for fulfilling the law: I anſwer that who conſenteth not to Concupiſcence fulfilleth it in al things which it commandeth to be performed vnder ſinne as S. Auſtin expreſly affirmeth in many places: as lib. de ſpirit. & lit. c. vlt. epiſt. 200 lib. 1. de nupt. & concupiſc. c. 29. lib. 2. de Geneſ. contr. Manich. c. 14. whoſe words we cited before: though if he haue Concupiſcence,

Sup. c. 1. parag. 13. & 18.

cence, he fulfil it not in a thing which the law, though it command not vnder sinne to be performed, yet it commandeth as the end to which we ought, al we can to endeuor and labor to attaine vnto. That to haue no Concupiscence at al, is commanded by the law, only as the end which we ought to endeuor vnto, is manifest both by S. Austins affirming that there is no sinne, when there is no consent, as also because in the very next words to those which Bel citeth he saith. *To this end the law said thou shalt not couet, that in this precept we might know both what in this mortality we ought to endeuor vnto by profiting, and whither we ought to attaine vnto in that most happy immortality.* Behold how he saith in this life we ought to endeuor, and in the next we ought to attaine to haue no lust. And tract. 41. in Ioan he saith. *I can not fulfil that which is said thou shalt not couet, What therfore is it needful to fulfil? that, Goe not after thy concupiscences.* Behold he prescribeth this only as needful to attaine vnto. And in the same place, and serm. 12. de verb. Apost. he noteth that S. Paul said not *you shal haue no il desires, or let not sinne be in your members*, but *let not sinne raigne.* As if he said. We are not bidden vnder sinne to haue no lust at al: and the reason saith he, and S. Gregory after him, is, because it is impossible.

How to haue no Cõcupiscence is commanded by the law and how not.

See more hereafter artic. 8. chap. 2 paragr. 3. and chap. 3. parag. 2.

S. Augustin. to. 9.

Item to. de Gen. cap. 12. tom. 3. cap. 5. to. 10.

S. Gregor. l. 21 Moral.

7. The

7. The ſecond thing which Bel inferreth and biddeth vs marke it wel is, That *the tenth commandement forbiddeth original luſt committed without conſent, and habitual concupiſcence*. Did euer man read more markable folly? 1. He maketh original luſt to be committed, which is to make original actual, becauſe what is committed is actual, as commiſſion is action: 2. That habitual, & original inclination to euil is forbidden by the tenth commandement, and calleth the contrary moſt abſurd. But nothing can be more abſurd then to ſay that original, and habitual inclination to euil is forbidden by this commandement: *Thou shal not couet*. For to couet is to doe, *ipſum agere concupiſcere eſt*. ſaith S. Auſtin ſerm. 5. de verb. Apoſt. c. 7. and therfore to make habits and inclinations forbidden in theſe words, is to make habits doings, inclinations actions. Or who euer heard that new borne infants ſinne againſt the tenth commandement, ſurely if that be ſo, we muſt cal them no more Innocents.

Bel pag. 48.

Original luſt made actual by Bel.

S. Auguſtin. to. 7.

Peccata propria non habent vnde illos merito Innocentes nũcupamus. Aug. 1. cont. Iul. c. 6. to. 7.

8. But let vs hear him proue this abſurdity. *For although* (ſaith he) *S. Paul were moſt free, and innocent from actual ſinne, becauſe he fought mightily againſt his raging concupiſcence, and did in no wiſe yeeld vnto it, yet was he guilty by reaſon of original concupiſcence*. Behold Bel

pag. 48.

Bel proueth idem per idem.

prouing *idem per idem*, and withal ouerthrowing whatsoeuer he manteineth in this article. For the doubt is, whether original Concupiscence be sinne, and this he proueth because S. Paul was guilty by reason of it. what is this but to proue original Concupiscence to be sinne, because it is sinne. And he affirmeth S. Paul to haue bene most free, and innocent from actual sinne, and proueth it because he fought mightily against his raging Concupiscence, and in no wise consented vnto it. which is in plaine tearms to confesse that inuoluntary motions of the flesh are no sinne, because they are not voluntary. O force of truth which breakest out of they professed aduersaries mouth. Surely Protestants may haue great ioy of such a challenger. And no maruel if he be desirous of an aduersary to fight withal, who for want of one falleth thus to fight with him self, and maketh his aduersaries sport to laugh, & moueth his friends to compassion and shame. But let vs see more of his pastime.

Contradict. 14.

Bel ouerthroweth at once what he intended to proue in al this Article.

Babilon is vvonne, Bel is confounded. Hiere. 50. v. 2.

Bel pag. 49.

Rom. 7. v. 7.

Math. 5. v. 22.

9. S. Paul had not known lust to be sinne except the law had said. Thou shalt not lust. But he could not be ignorant that Concupiscence with consent was sinne, seeing the very heathens did know, and confesse it. Againe. *Voluntary lust is forbidden in the sixt, seuenth, and eighth comandement as Christ*

as Christ him selfe expoundeth them. Therfore the tenth forbiddeth the very habitual desire, and inclination and fruits therof though not consented vnto: Answer. S. Paul was so far from knowing by the law that natural inclination to sinne is formal sinne, as nether he, nor any man of iudgment could imagine it til Bel with a new kinde of philosophy taught vs that habits are acts, and inclinations actiõs. But to the argument I deny the assumption. For he might be ignorant that lust which is only indirectly voluntary, and in the cause, because it is not preuented, is sinne, and this he might know by the law: nether can Bel shew that euer any heathen knew this. Yea he might be ignorant, that Concupiscence directly voluntary, when it is not put in execution, is true sinne & learne this by the law. For if Iosephus, and Kimhi though they had the law, and were great Rabbins in it, yet thought such concupiscence no sinne: and Iosephus reprehended Polybius for condemning it as a sinne; why might not the Apostle haue bene ignorant of this, if the law had not taught it him. Neither doth Bels reason cõuince the contrary. For though some Heathen by great study in moral philosophy came to know this truth, yet perhaps S. Paul could not or rather as he saieth did not. And Bel as we

See S. Austin serm. 4. de verb. Apost. c. 4. & 5. to. 10.

Concupiscence indirectly voluntary knowne of S. Paul by the law to be sinne.

Iosephus l. 12. Antiquit. c. 12. Kimhi in psal. 66.

shal see hereafter citeth a place out of S. Ambros where he writeth, that the Apostle thought Concupiscence no sinne *because it delighted, and seemed a harmles thing to couet*, yet better it is to say: (as I haue already) that S. Paul meaneth, that by the law he came to know al voluntary concupiscence, though it be but indirectly voluntary, to be sinne, and this nether he nor any Heathen could haue known, but by the law, or by Gods reuelation.

S. Ambros. in cap. 7. ad Rom.

10. Bels second reason maketh against him self. For if inuoluntary motions be as true sinnes as voluntary, why are not they forbidden as wel in the sixt, seuenth, and eighth cõmandement as these? And albeit voluntary motions were implicitly forbidden, when the external acts were prohibited, yet it was necessary to forbid them expresly in the last commandement for to inculcat it into the hard hartes of the Iewes: nether yet with this expresse forbiddance wold some of them beleeue voluntary concupiscence without the fact to be sinne, as appeareth by the example of Iosephus Kimhi, and diuers Iewes, Math 5. v. 29. After this Bel alleadgeth a place of S. Austin wher he calleth desires of Concupiscence il, filthy, and not lawful, which haue bene explicated before, and are verifyed of

Chapt. 1. parag. 2. & 3.

inuo-

inuoluntary Concupiſcence, becauſe it is materially ſinne, wanting nothing to be formally ſo but voluntarines, which Bel here goeth about to proue that they want not, but his proofe hath bene refuted before. Chapt. 1. parag. 1. & 3. Chapt. 1. parag. 11.

11. After the ſaid ptoofe he auoucheth Bellarmin to confeſſe that S. Auſtin acknowledgeth euen inuoluntary motions to be properly ſinne, and flatly condemned by the tenth Commandement, and in the margent biddeth vs ſee S. Auſtin lib. de ſpirit. & lit. c. vlt. becauſe Bellarmin writeth *that S. Auſtin teacheth al kind of motions of Concupiſcence to be aliquo modo in ſome ſort prohibited by that lavv. Thou ſhalt not couet.* Wheras Bellarmin profeſſeth. That *S. Auſtin not only no Where in plaine words ſaith al Concupiſcence is properly ſinne, but alſo affirmeth the contrary in al the tomes of his Works*, and in the words cited by Bel is ſo far from ſaying, that S. Auſtin thinketh al motions to be flatly condemned, as he wold not abſolutly ſay they were condemned but only with this limitation *in ſome ſort*, vz as far, as they lye in our powre, which limitation though Bel without proofe cal deceitful, and contrary to S. Auſtins meaning, yet haue we before shewed it out of S. Auſtin to be his true meaning. And I wold Bel had ſeene that place *Bel pag. 51.* Bellarm. lib. 5. de amiſſ. grat. & ſtat. pec. c. 10. *vntruth 56* Bellar. ſup. c. 8. Sup. parag. 6.

of S. Auſtin to which he ſendeth vs: for there ſhould he haue heard S. Auſtin teaching him that inuoluntary Concupiſcence is ſo far from ſinne, as if we conſent not to it we need not ſay in our lords prayer. Forgiue vs our treſpaſſes. And thus much of his proofs out of S. Auſtin.

CHAP. IIII.

Bels arguments out of S. Ambros, S. Bede, S. Thomas touching Concupiſcence anſwvered.

Bel pag. 52. AFTER his proofs out of S. Auſtin Bel very methodically (forſooth) returneth to Scripture citing a ſentence of S. Ihon in greek, *pas ho poion hamartian cai ten ano mian poiei, cai he hamartia eſtin anomia*: and tranſlateth it thus. *Euery one that ſinneth tranſgreſſeth the lavv; and ſinne is the tranſgreſſion of the law.* This place he citeth againe art. 6. to proue al ſinne of it ſelfe to be mortal, and for that purpoſe it hath ſome shew of proofe: but how it proueth al kind of Concupiſcence to be proper ſinne, paſſeth my intelligence. For ſuppoſe that al ſinne were tranſgreſſion of the law, (which he laboreth much to proue, & wil neuer performe) what is this to proue. That al Concupiſcence is ſinne? And leſt of al it concerneth habitual

Bel forgetteth his matter.

habitual cõcupiſcence. For S. Ihon ſpeaketh only of actual ſinne, as appeareth by thoſe words *poiei amartian poiei anomian, committeth ſinne committeth iniquity.* And yet ſpendeth he fowre leaues in nothing but in prouing *anomia* to ſignify tranſgreſſion of the law, and euery ſinne to be tranſgreſſion of the law, & ſaith that *Papiſts are put to a non plus. about the doctrin of concupiſcence in the regenerate: for both anomia and adicia is truly, and fitly tearmed iniquity*: But what shal a man ſay to ſuch vanity? Be *anomia*, or *adicia* what you wil, be al ſinne tranſgreſſion of the law: proue you that al concupiſcence is formal ſinne? The queſtion is now, not what *anomia* or *adicia*, or ſinne is, but what concupiſcence is, from which Bel flying into an other queſtion, sheweth him ſelfe to be at a non plus. Wherfore remitting this place of S. Ihon with al which he bringeth to proue that euery ſinne is tranſgreſſion, to the 6. article, to which it belongeth and nothing concerneth this: I wil anſwer only foure authorities, which he abuſeth to proue inuoluntary concupiſcence to be ſinne. *pag. 58.*

2. The firſt is of S. Ambroſe in c. 7. Rom. where he ſaith that *a man is not free from cryme, becauſe he ſinneth inuitus vnwillingly or againſt his wil.* Where Bel noteth that he calleth concupiſcence cryme, or mortal *Bel pag. 56. S. Ambroſ.*

sinne. And, That a man sinneth in that which he doth against his wil. But besides that the Author of those commentaries is not S. Ambrose: he meaneth not of concupiscence but of custome of sinning, which begun in the sinner (saith he) *by his owne fault, and sloath, and wherby he is laded and sooner yeeldeth to sinne then to the law, and though he wold do good, yet is he oppressed by custome.* And therfore when he saith that such a one is not free from cryme in sinning against his wil, he meaneth not of absolute, and resolute wil to the contrary (for custome can not make a man to do a thing against his absolute wil, but of an imperfect wil which diuers cal velleity, which most sinners, though neuer so accustomed to sinne, haue to do good, and against which kind of wil they sinne: but are not therfore (as that Author saith truly free from cryme, because (notwithstanding this imperfect wil of doing wel) they haue an absolute and perfect wil to sinne. And so this place concerneth nothing acts of concupiscence altogether inuoluntary and against both perfect, and imperfect wil.

3. An other testimony he citeth out of S. Ambrose in the same place where he saith. *That S. Paul separated not this concupiscence from sinne, but mingled it.* But he meaneth

neth only of voluntary acts, as is euident by the reaſon, wherwith he proueth that this concupiſcence ſeemed no ſinne, *becauſe* (ſaith he) *it delighted, and ſeemed ſimplex cauſa, a harmles matter to couet a thing of our neighbour.*

4. The third authority is of S. Bede, whom he confeſſeth to haue bene renowned through out the chriſtian world for learning, and vertue. And if he thinke as he writeth he thinketh Papiſtry to be true piety. For S. Bede was a notorious Papiſt approuing Maſſe, honoring of reliques, images, prayer for the dead, purgatory, and other ſuch points of Papiſtry as is euident out of his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory. Bel alleadgeth him becauſe he ſaith. *They ſinne who of frailty (lat: infirmitas) corrupt innocency.* What is here to the purpoſe? who deny that ſinne may be done as wel of frailty, as of malice? For ſeeing none is ſo fraile, but he is aſſiſted by Gods grace in which he may do al: Philip. 4. v. 13. and is not ſuffered to be tempted aboue his powre. 1. Corinth. 10. v. 13. if he ſinne of frailty he ſinneth voluntarily. *Bel pag. 57.* S. Beda 1. Io. 3. S. Paul.

5. His fourth authority is out of S. Thomas ſaying. *That what a man doth without deliberation of reaſon he doth it not perfectly, becauſe the principal thing in man doth it not, and therfore it is not perfectly a humaine act, and ſo perfectly neither* *Bel pag. 59.* S. Thom. 12. q. 74. art. 3.

ther vertue, nor sinne, but imperfectly. Wherfore such a motion of sensuality, preuenting reason is a venial, & imperfect sinne. Out of these words Bel noteth these important obseruations as he calleth them 1. *That S. Thomas is a Popish* pag. 132. *Saint.* 2. *That for his great learning* (and Bel to his confusion confesseth him to haue bene a great Cleark indeed) *he was surnamed the Angelical Doctor.* 3. *That P. Vrban 4. and Innocent 5. confirmed his doctrin for authentical and gaue it the first place after Cononical Scripture.* How wel these three notes are gathered out of S. Thomas his foresaid words let euery one be iudge. But Bel can gather quodlibet ex quolibet, water out of a flint stone.

6. But I must note out of Bels important vntruth 57. obseruations diuers important vntruths. 1. vntruth. 58 That P. Vrban 4. and P. Innocent 5. confirmed S. Thomas his doctrin for authentical. 2. That P. Vrban 4. gaue it the first place after Canonical Scripture. Indeed P. Vrban 4. highly admired his doctrin, as if it were sent from heauen, & P. Innocēt in a sermon as a preacher by way of exaggeratiō gaue it the first place after Scripture, but neither did they confirme it as authentical, nether did both of them giue it the next vntruth 59. place after Scripture. The 3. vntruth (which he repeateth twise in this page, & very often in his booke) is. *That we are bound to defend, and*

Vrban. in Confirmat. doctrinæ S. Thomæ.

Innocent. in sermo. Ecce pluſquam Salomon hic.

and beleeue S. Thomas his doctrin, and may not in any case refuse or deny it. This is a manifest vntruth. For albeit S. Thomas be, and that worthely of the greatest authority amongst schoolmen, yet his doctrin may and is often denyed in schools (as Bel hath heard many tymes) where it concerneth no matter of faith, yea Bel him selfe art. 7. pag. 133. affirmeth him to be commonly denyed about the conception of our Lady. And P. Vrban 4. commanded only the vniuersity of Tholouse to teach, and follow, *especially* (saith he) his doctrin. Wherby we see he commanded them not to follow his doctrin only, and none others, but chiefly his, nor as an infallible truth, but as most probable. Other vniuersities, and Catholiques are left to their liberty to follow (excepting matter of faith wherin al agree, or only erre of ignorance) what schoolmen they please. *Contradict. 15.*

7. And this is so notorious as when we obiect to Protestants their dissention in matters of faith, they returne vpon vs the disagreement of schoolmen. But there is a great difference. For the disagreement of schoolmen is in things wherin S. Austin l. 1. contr. Iulian. c. 6. *The learnedest, and best defenders of Catholique verity, may salua fidei compage, disagree, and one say better and truer then an other.* And if of ignorance any of them *The disagreement of Schoolemen far different from that of Protestants. S. Austin.*

them erre it is alwaies with readines to submit them selues to the iudgment of the Catholique Church. Wheras Protestants disagree about matters, which belong (as S. Austin speaketh) *ad ipsa fidei fundamenta.* And omitting those notorious dissentions amongst them, about the real presence, the number of Canonical books, Christs suffering the paines of hel, his discent into hel, & the like I wil propose a few other points of dissention amongst them, gathered out of the conference at Hampton court. as 1: *Whether baptisme by vvoemen be allowable*: pag. 8. 14. 15. 17. 18. 2. *vvhether confirmation be lawful* pag. 10. 3. *vvhether baptisme be necessary* pag. 16. 4. *vvhether after receaving the holy Ghost We may totally depart from grace.* pag. 28. 5. *vvhether the communion booke contradict the 15. article of their faith.* pag. 25. 6. *vvhether there ought to be any Bishops.* pag. 36. 7. *vvhether the intention of the Minister be essential to the Sacrament.* pag. 38. 8. *Vvhether a man once iustifyed remaine truly iust before God, Whatsoeuer sinne he commit.* pag. 41. and 14. 9. *vvhether a iustifyed man falling into greeuous sinnes shal be saued without repentance for them* 16. 10. *vvhether the English Byble be truly translated.* pag. 45. 46. 11. *vvhether the communion booke corrupt the Byble in two places.* pag. 63. 12. *vvhether the Crosse be to be vsed in baptisme.* pag. 65. 13. *Vvhether the Church can institute, an external*

Sup.

Dissentions of Protestants touched in their late Conference.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.

external significant signe. pag. 67. 14. *vvhether the Churches institution can bynde in conscience.* pag. 70. 15. *VVhether the communion booke containe errors repugnant to Scripture.* pag. 59. 14. 15.

8. Moreouer more then a thousand Ministers whom the whole vniuersity of Oxford calleth *their brethren and fellovv laborers in the Lords harueſt* in the ſupplication to his Maieſtie exhibited in April. 1603. profeſſe. That *there is not in their Church an Vniformity of doctrin.* This the Oxonians deny againſt their owne knowledge, and the knowlege of al England. For what vniformity is there, where a thouſand Miniſters their fellow laborers profeſſe them ſelues to diſagree in points of religion from the reſt yea his Maieſtie witneſſeth him ſelfe *to haue receaued many complaints through the diſſentions in the Church, and purpoſeth* (as he ſaith) *to ſetle an Vniforme order through the vvhole Church, and to plant Vnity* Wil now the Oxonians ſay there are no diſſentions? wil they make his Maieſtie actum agere in ſetling vniformity, and planting vnity where none wanteth. And in like ſort of the Scottish Church he teſtifyeth. *That there is ſuch diſſention euen in the Catachiſme doctrin, as vvhat vvas Catachiſme doctrin in one congregation vvas ſcarſly accepted as ſound and orthodox in an other.* And this diſſention amongſt Proteſtants about matters

In their Supplicatiō exhibited in April 1603.

Anſvver to the Supplication.

Conference p. 5. 22.

Conference p. 44.

ters of religion is with such obstinacy, as notwithstanding proclamations, disputations, conferences, and decrees, or Canons of their Church it remaineth stil amongst them, and wil as long as heresy remayneth in them, which teacheth them to expound Scriptures according to their priuate spirits and to recant nothing, *because* (as his Maiestie saith of the Scottish Ministers) *it standeth not vvith their credits.*

Conference p. 102.

9. The fourth note, which Bel gathereth out of S. Thomas his words, is more to the purpose vz. *That motions of concupiscence preuenting reason are venial sinnes.* But if Bel had amongst his important obseruations obserued also that S. Thomas spake immediatly before of deliberate reason, he might haue noted that he meant only of such motions as preuent perfect but not imperfect deliberation, and *therfore are* (as he saith) *imperfect or venial sinnes: VVherfore be myndful* (Bel) *from vvhence thou art falne and do penance.* Apocalip. 2.

THE

THE FIFT ARTICLE OF THE MERIT OF GOOD WORKES.

CHAP. I.

Of the Proteſtants enmity to good vvorks and friendſhip vvith euil.

BEL beginneth this Article with a greeuous complaint againſt Papiſts *who* (ſaith he) *moſt vnchriſtianly ſlander the profeſſors of Chriſts Ghoſpel, as though they vvere enemies to good vvorks, of vvhich they thinke, ſpeak, teach, and vvrite more chriſtianly, and more religiouſly then Papiſts do.* Both theſe points he proueth no otherwiſe then with an (*I ſay*) *I ſay* (ſaith he) *that good vvorks though they can not go before, yet do euer follovv iuſtification, are neceſſary to ſaluation, and true effects of predeſtination.* As if Bel were al the new Ghoſpellers, or they al agreed with him concerning good works: We alleadge their words, produce their deeds, ſhew the fruits, and effects of their enmity to good works, and Bel thinketh to anſwer al this with

Bel pag. 60.

with an (I say) Surely he presumeth of beneuolous, and partial iudges, or he wold neuer answer thus. He with an (*I say*) may slader Popes, Princes & Papists whatsoeuer, and an I say, yea manifest proofe to the contrary, wil not suffice him. Such force his I sayes haue: *Dixit & facta sunt*: But Syr I both say, & wil proue by words, and deeds that both you, and your Ghospellers are not only enemies to good works, but great frends to euil works. And as for enmity to good works.

2. First they bid vs beware of good works. *Let vs beware* (saith Luther) *of sinne, but much more of lawes, and good works.* And some of his schollers in the conference of Altenburg teach vs *to pray that we persever vnto the end in faith without good vvorks*: 2. they teach good works to be harmful: *Good vvorks* (said the forsaid Lutherans) *are pernitious to saluation.* Againe. *Christians vvith good vvorks belong to Sathan*: And as Surius, Staphilus and others report a Minister was not allowed in Saxony because he beleeued not this: 3. because they say al good works are sinne, and vnclean so Luther art. 23. Caluin 3 instit. c. 14. parag. 9. & 11. c. 15. parag. 3. and 4. Whitaker contr. Duræ. l. 1. p. 49. Bucley answer to 8. reasons p. 111. and 109. Perkins tit of merit. and Bel art. 4. pag. 48.

Luther. sermon. de nouo testamẽto seu de Missa. Colloquiũ Attenburg.

Surius comment. Ann. 1564. Staphil. in Apolog.

tea-

teacheth that ſinne is alwaies annexed to good works: 4. They teach that good works of their nature deſerue damnation: *There was neuer* (ſaith Caluin lib. 3. inſtit. c. 14. parag. 11.) *any work of a godly man which if it were examined by Gods ſeuere iudgment were not damnable.* How can Proteſtants now be friēds to good workes which they bid beware of, account hurtful, ſinne, and damnable? Surely their friendſhip can be no better then Ioabs was to Amaſa when he kiſſed him, but withal thruſt his dagger into his body. 2. Reg. 20.

Epicure would ſeeme to loue vertue though he made pleaſure his end.

Habentes ſpeciem pietatis virtutem autem eius abnegantes. 2. Timoth. 4. v. 5.

3. And on the contrary ſide their friendſhip to euil works is manifeſt. 1. becauſe they teach that euil works make not an euil man, nor any can damne a man but incredulity: this Luther teacheth in plaine tearms: lib. de libert. Chriſtian. and lib. de capt. Babil. c. de baptiſ. 2. becauſe they make God author of ſinne: Zuinglius ſaith. *Numen ipſum author eſt eius quod in nobis eſt iniuſtitia:* God him ſelf is author of that which in vs is iniuſtice. And Caluin lib. 1. inſtit. c. 18. parag. 3. After he had brought diuers proofs hereof concludeth thus: *Iam ſatis aperte oſtendi Deum vocari eorum omnium authorem quæ iſti Cenſores volunt otiosè tantum eius permiſſu contingere.* Now haue I plainely enough shewed that God is called the Au-

Frendship of Proteſtants to euil works.

Luther.

Zvvinglius ſermon. de Prouidentia ad Principem Cattorum 1530. c. 5.

Caluin in playne termes maketh God author of ſinne.

thor (heare Bel, & Blush) of al these things which these Censurers wil haue to fal out only through his idle permission. And Melanchton wrote, *That the adultery of Dauid, and treason of Iudas was the work of God like as the vocation of S. Paul.* 3. Beza teacheth that our spirit must wrastle against sinne, but so as it ouercome not: Are not these (Bel) particuler fauors to euil works to say they make no man euil, that none but one of them damne men, that God is their author, that we must let them ouercome, or were not these whom I named professors of your Ghospel.

Melanchton in cap. 8. ad Rom.

Beza Rom. 6.v.12.

4. But if we look into their deeds, and fruits, therin we shal clearly see how mortal foes they are to good, and great frends to euil works. For there is nether man nor nation, which of a Catholike becommeth a Protestant, but he doth fewer good works, les fast, and pray, seldomer giue almes, do fewer works of charity then before, and more euil then before, as in ryot pride auarice, iniustice, & the like. For proofe hereof I propose only England for example, whither there be not now les fasting, praying, almes giuing, building of Churches, Hospirals, Colledges, Schools, then there was in Catholique tyme. And on the contrary side whither prisons be not fuller of male-

Fox Considerat. 3. saith English Protestants are soe il as he thinketh they could not be worse if they would. Read considerat. 4. before his Martyral.

factors

factors, more endited of theftes, murders, rapes, and other villanies, and far more executed then in former tymes. And whether it be not growne almoſt into a common prouerbe that a mans obligatiõ now, is not ſo good as his word was in former tymes. And in theſe 46. yeares of Proteſtantiſme, when more then ſo many thouſands of Proteſtants haue bene executed for murders, theft, robberies, rapes, coyning, purſecutting, and like villanies; let Bel name how many Catholiques haue bene ſo much as called in queſtion for ſuch offences: yea this encreaſe of ſinne, and euil works by Proteſtantiſme is ſo notorious as Proteſtants confeſſe it. Luther ſaid his followers were become *ten tymes worſe then Sodomits*: a Bullinger teſtifyeth that in his church *euery where encreaſeth haughtines, pride, auarice, vſury, blaſphemy, ſlander, ribauldry, drunkenes, gluttony ryotouſnes, lechery, inceſt, wrath, murder, contention, and enuy.* Wigand confeſſeth that *youth grow worſe, & les tractable, & dare commit thoſe vices to which men of ripe years in tymes paſt were not ſubiect.* Eraſmus writeth of Proteſtants that he hath *ſeene many of them become worſe but none better.* Let theſe different fruits ſhew the difference of theſe trees, let the effects teſtify, whither Proteſtants or Catholiques think more religiouſly of good works,

Luther. apud Sur. 1566.

Bullinger. in Coron. Apolog. cont. Brent.

VVigand de malis Germaniæ. Sec. Sur. 1566.

Ex fructibus eorum cognoſcetis eos. Math. 7. v. 16.

whether ministers or Priests teach the people more *to eschew euil, and do good.* Now let vs come to Bels positions of good works, whereby he hopeth to wipe away this deserued name which Protestants haue of being enemies to good works.

Psalm. 36.

Chap. II.

Of Bels positions touching good vvorks.

Bel pag. 60. BEls first position containeth two partes the first is *that good works neither do, nor can go before iustification.* Behold Bel euen where he wold proue him self to be a friēd to good works, shewing him self to be an enemy, & excluding them from any going before, or any way concurring to iustification, to which they so concurred in S. Mary Magdalen as our Sauiour said *many sins are forgiuen her, because she loued much,* making her loue a kinde of cause, vz disponent of her iustification. But because Bel proueth his position not at al, I wil stand no longer to disproue it. The second part of his position is: *That good works euer follow (as fruits the tree) the persons that are freely iustifyed.* This is most manifestly false in infants wherof many iustifyed in baptisme, dye before they do any good worke. And if his comparison

Luc. 7. 7. 47.

riſon of the tree be good, ſome iuſtifyed, neuer do good worke, and al want them long tyme, ſome giue ouer doing good, as ſome trees are barren, ſome ceaſe to beare fruit, and none beare alwaies. And I wold know of Bel, whither Dauid were iuſtifyed when he committed adultery, and murder. If then he were not iuſt? then loſt he his fruits, if iuſt? I wold know of Bel what good worke he did in tyme of his adultery, and murder. Likwiſe whither Proteſtants be euer doing good works, or ſome tymes be not iuſt, and become infidels.

2. His ſecond poſitiō is: *That good Workes goe ſo neceſſarily before ſaluatiō, that no man without them can attaine eternal life', When poſſibility is graunted to do them*, and afterwarde calleth them the *Vſual ordinary means by Which God bringeth men to ſaluation*. This is true doctrin, if it be meant of good works commanded, but how it agreeth with Proteſtants doctrin before cited, paſſeth my capacity, yea how it agreeth with his owne doctrin that *there is no good Worke Which wanteth ſinne*; is thinke we ſinne neceſſary to ſaluation, or an vſual, & vndoubted meane to come to heauen? moreouer if Proteſtants thinke their works to be the meane to ſaluation, they wil no more charge Papiſts with truſting to be ſaued by their works.

Bel pag. 60 72.

Sup. c. 1. parag. 2.

pag. 48.

Bel pag. 61. 3. His third position is: *That good Works are the true effects of Predestination.* This if it be so meant, that al, and only predestinate do good works, is most false: for many infants are predestinat, and yet dye before they do good works, and many reprobate men do good works, as appeareth by Simon Magus who beleeued, and cleued to S. Philip Act. act. 8. v. 13. But most absurd it is which he addeth *that the children of God by good Works make their saluation sure vnto them selfs, and manifest to the world,* if he meane as Protestants do of such security, as is void of al doubt, or feare of the contrary. Because none can be so assured of Gods wil touching their saluation, but by manifest reuelation from God him self; but good works are no such reuelation ether to our selfs, or to others. Ergo by them nether we, nor others can be assured of our saluation. The proposition is manifest. The assumption I proue: 1. because reprobats may somtymes do good works, as did Simon Magus. Ergo: good works are no reuelation of saluation, 2. because euen the worker is not assured that his work is good, wanting no cõdition requisit to goodnes: for as Iob saith c. 9. *although I be simple, this same my soul shal not know,* and much les others can be assured of the goodnes of the work: for they not knowing

In omnibus actionibus in quibus tibi es bene conscia nũquam audeas esse securus. Ambros. epist. 84.

Iob 9. 21.

knowing the purpose and intention for which the worke is done (according to that of Ieremy. *Mans hart is inscrutable, vvho shal knovv it?* and that of S. Paul *vvhat man knovveth the things of man, but the spirit of man that is in him*) can neuer be assured that the worke is fully good. 3. though I and others were assured that I do good works this day, yet nether I nor others can be assured, that hereafter I shal do good works, whensoeuer I shal haue possibility, or tyme, and yet Bel auoucheth that vnles we do good works when we haue tyme, or possibility therto we can not be saued. Ergo: good works make no vndoubted assurance of saluation. 4. good works are sinful and offensiue to God (as Protestants affirme) Ergo: according to their doctrin, they can be no euident signe of Gods fauor, and of our saluation: but rather of his wrath, and our damnation. And if Bel be so wel skilled in mens fortunes, as by their works he can euidently foretel their saluation, let him play the Aegiptian and tel Protestants whether they shal be saued, or damned. For if he can assure them of their saluation he wil get more in one day then his fifty pound pension, wherewith he is hyred to preach and write against Catholiques: and I can send him to one Protestant noble man, who wold giue

Hierem.17. 7. 9. 1. Corinth. 2. 7. 11.

pag. 61. 72.

him ten thowsand pownd to be assured of his saluation. Finally this doctrin of his is not only against Catholiques, but also against his Maister Caluin who saith *labascit fides &c. faith quaileth if it respect good works: for none of the holiest men shal finde there wheron to trust:* And good reason for if good works be sinne (as Caluin and Protestants teach) what assurance or confidence can sinne giue vs of saluation.

Caluin. 3. instit. c. 11. parag. 11.

Bel pag. 61.

4. His fourth position is: *That good works are nether cause of predestination, nor of iustification, nether do, nor can merit ex condigno eternal life.* Touching the first point of predestination, there is no controuersy. For al Catholiques do with S. Austin against the Pelagians deny predestination to grace, to proceed of our merits, and the same do Deuines commonly affirme of predestination to glory, though this be no matter of faith. Nether is there any difficulty about the second point concerning iustification. For though faith and repentance dispose to iustificatiō: yet Catholiques thinke them not to be proper cause and merit therof. as Caluin, Perkins, and Willet confesse. But the third point of meriting *de condigno* is that *about which I* (saith Bel) *contend with the Papists at this present, and namely with the Councel of Trent.* But because he proceedeth in this article

Auguſt. l. de bono perſeueran. epiſt. 105. & alibi.

See Bellar. l. 2. de Grat. & lib. arb. c. 15.

Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 6. c. 8.

Caluin. 3. inſtit. c. 14. parag. 11.
Perkins refor. Cathol. p. 64.
VVillet contract. 17. q. 3. part. 3. p. 588.

article confusedly enough confounding many questions together, and in stead of a point of Catholique faith impugneth a schoole point, I wil particulerly by Conclusions set downe the Catholiques opinions concerning this matter.

Bel impugneth a Schole point for a point of faithe.

Chap. III.

The Catholiques doctrine touching merit particulerly set downe and proued.

AS about any matter, the first kinde of question is about the existence, whether it be or no? the second about the nature, or quality, what a one it is? and the last about the causes thereof, why it is such or such? So about merit of eternal life the first kinde of question is, whether there be any, or none. The second about the nature of this merit, whether it be *ex condigno*, and worthely deserue the reward, or *de congruo*, & only haue a certaine cõgruity, & agreeablenes therto. And if it be *de condigno*: whether it be absolute, and suppose or require no condition of Gods promise to reward it: or conditional, supposing the said promise: Likewise whether it be perfect hauing iust, and arithemetical equality to the reward, as a penny hath to a pennyworth; or imperfect hauing only due proportion, and vertual

vertual equality to the reward, as accidents be a proportionat disposition to substance, and great labors for Gods Church a proportionat desert of a Bishoprik, and seed vertually equal to the tree: The third kinde of question is about the causes of this nature of merit, to wit, whether this condignity of merit rise, partly of any proportion or sufficiency which is in the merit vnto the the reward, or wholy and entirely of Gods free acceptation, who seeing vs do the best we can to deserue heauen, accepteth it as a condigne, and sufficient merit therof, though of it selfe it be not. And to these questions I wil answer by the Conclusions ensuing.

2. First Conclusion: There is merit of eternal life, and our supernatural works done by Gods grace (wherof only we speak in this matter) are meritorious of eternal life, and glory. This is a point of faith with Catholiques, defyned in the Councel of Trent. sess. 6. can 32. and denyed by no Catholique though Bel falsly affirme the contrary of some, and taught of holy Fathers, and antient writers, as Bel confesseth, and therfore graunted by him selfe in words, though he expouud merit by Impetration. This he calleth a godly sense, which is indeed his vsual vngodly shift

Concil. Trident.
Bel pag. 75.
pag. 61.

vsed

vſed of him hereafter art. 6. & 8. & of Proteſtants commonly, when they dare not deny an Authors words, to deny his meaning For who ſeeth not that merit is a quite different thing from Impetration; for to merit is to deſerue, to impetrate is to obtain by requeſt, beggars may be ſaid to impetrat but not to merit their almes, and an hyred ſeruãt meriteth, not impetrateth his wages. Merit ſuppoſeth ſome iuſtice, Impetration only prayers, in the obteiner, and liberality in the giuer, merit may be, though the reward be not giuen: Impetration ſuppoſeth the graunt therof· Merit anſwereth to reward: Impetration to gift. Merit requireth at leſt ſome proportion in the worke to the reward: Impetration none at al.

Merit quite different from impetration.
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.

3. And euident it is that Fathers by merit vnderſtãd not impetration. For S. Auſtin epiſt. 105. writeth that. *As death is rendred as a ſtipend to the merit of ſinne, ſo is euerlaſting life as a ſtipend to the merit of iuſtice.* S. Ireney l. 4. c. 72. ſaith. *By good works we conquer heauen*: S. Baſil. orat. in init prouerb: *By good works we buy heauen* S. Gregory Nazian: *For good work we may exact reward, not as grace but as playne debt.* S. Hierom epiſt. ad Celant. God hath cauſe to reward vs. S. Chriſoſtom hom. 7. in epiſt. Rom. calleth vs. *Gods creditors, and vſurers* and him *our debtor.* and hom. 3. *de La-*

S. Auguſtin. tom. 2. Deus propoſuit regnum cælorum vænale in ep. 93.
S. Ireney.
S. Baſil. prope fin.
S. Greg. Naz. orat. 3. in bapt.
S Hierom.
S. Chryſoſt. to. 4.
Tom. 2.

de Lazaro: that by good workes we deserue
Bel pag. 77. heauen, as by euil hel. Yea Bel him selfe admitteth more then impetration, when hereafter he cõfesseth heauen to be due to good
Contradict. 16. workes; for where duty is there is not meere impetration, & that works are to heauen as the loane of a cloake in a shower of rayne vpon promise of an hundred pownds, for
pag. 79. here is some iustice. And professeth to de-
Durand. 2. d. 27. quæst. 2. fend Durands opinion who vndoubtedly
expressly admitteth more then simple impetration.
admitteth con digne me- But if Bel had remembred his owne, and
rit. the common doctrin of Protestants before
Cap. 1. parag. 2. rehearsed that al good works whatsoeuer are sinne, he wold neuer haue graunted that they are impetratorious of Gods fauor, and reward. For how cã sinne impetrate fauour, or reward, and not rather offence, and punishment? Wherupon Perkins in plaine
Perkins re- for. Cathol. tearms affirmeth that our righteousnes is
Of merits. not capable of merit, and vtterly renoun-
p. 112. 104. ceth al merit of man. And Caluin not only
Caluin. 3. instit. c. 15. parag. 4. & 2. abhorreth the name of merit, affirming it to be proude, and to obscure Gods grace, and to make men proude, but professeth that *our good vvorks are euer sprinkled vvith many filthinesses for vvhich God may be iustly offended, and angry vvith vs: so far* (saith he) *are they from purchasing his fauour, or procuring his liberality towards vs.* Thus we see how conformably

Bel

Bel speaketh to his owne, and his fellow Ministers doctrine. *Bel against his fellow Ministers.*

4. Second Conclusion. Good workes done in Gods grace are condignely meritorious of eternal life. This is that which Bel impugneth in this Article as a point of our faith and auoucheth it to be defyned by the Councel of Trent but falsly. For the Councel hath no word of condigne merit but only of true merit which in plaine tearms Bel him selfe dare not impugne or deny. *If any shal say* (saith the Councel) *that a iustified man by good workes which he doth by the grace of God and merit of Iesus Christ, whose liuely member he is, doth not truly deserue increase of grace, eternal life, and consecution therof, if he departe in grace, and also increase of glory, be he accursed.* Here are good works defyned to be true merit of glory, without determining whither they be cõdigne merit therof or no. Wherupon vega who was one of the Deuines of the coũcel writeth de fid. & ope. q. 4. That some noble schoole diuines being moued (saith he) with no light arguments and vsing a certaine sober and prudent moderation, haue denyed that there is any condigne merit of eternal happines. And againe. It is certaine (saith he) that there is merit in our works and some of them be meritorious, but of what reward and how they

Trident. sess. 6. can. 32.

Vega.

they are meritorious, it is in controuersy, & there are diuers opiniõs amõgst the schoole diuines. And q. 5. he affirmeth Gregory, Durand, Marsil, Walden, Burgensis and Eckins to deny condigne merit. Satus also an other diuine of the sayd Councel l. 3. de Nat. & Grat. c. 7. saith that there is some difference amongst Catholiques about condigne merit, and c. 8. after he had proued condigne merit out of the Councel and otherwaies, yet concludeth not that it is a point of faith but only calleth it *conclusionem probatissimam* a most approued Conclusion. And Bellarmin whome Bel tearmeth the mouth of Papists, lib. 5. de iustific. cap. 16. after he had rehearsed twoe opinions of Catholiques, wherof the one seemeth plainly to deny condigne merit, the other admitteth it only in a large sense, proposeth and defendeth the third opinion which defendeth condigne merit absolutly, only as *Verissimam & communem sententiam Theologorum*, most true and the common opinion of Diuines as indeed it is and we shal proue it anone against Bel. Hereby appeareth Bels shameful proceeding in this Article, in impugning condigne merit as a point of faith defyned by the Councel of Trent, which hath no word of condigne merit, and omitting the question of true merit which the Councel

Gregor. 1. d. 27. q. 1. Durand. q. 2. Marsil. in 2. VValden. de sacra. c. 7. Burgens. in psalm. 35. Eckins in centur. de predest.

Councel defyned & Catholiques defend as a point of their faith againſt Proteſtants.

5. The third Concluſion is: that This condigne merit is not abſolute, but ſuppoſeth the condition of Gods promiſe made to reward it. This is held of the beſt Diuines and proued at large by Bellarmin. l. 5 de iuſtifi. c. 14. The fourth Concluſion is that This condigne merit in our works, is not perfect, hauing actual, and perfect arithmetical equality before explicated: This manifeſtly the Fathers teach with al Catholiques, and Bels arguments hereafter brought conuince it, and no more. The fifte Concluſion is that the imperfect cõdigne merit which is in our works to heauen, riſeth not meerly of Gods acceptation, but partly of the due proportion, and ſufficiency before explicated, in them to the reward. This likewiſe is no matter of faith, yet truth taught by S. Thomas 1. 2. 4. 114. ar. 1. & 3. Bonauent. 2. d. 17. and Deuines in that place cõmonly: Bellar; l. 5. de Iuſtif. c. 17. though Scot. 1. d. 17. and ſome others deny it with whom Bel alſo falleth in league towards the end of this Article. The ſixt Concluſion is: that the ſaid condignity riſeth not of any due proportion, which is in the ſubſtance of our worke if it be conſidered in it ſelfe, but as it is the fruit of the holy Ghoſt mouing vs to do it,

This ſeemeth defyned. Conc. Trid. ſeſſ. 6. c. vlt. & in Bulla Pij 5. & Gregor. 13.

S. Auguſt. in pſal. 93. to. 8. S. Chryſoſt. 2. Cor. 9. S. Bernard. ſerm 1. de Annuntiat.

S. Thomas. S. Bonauent.

Bellarm. Scotus.

Bel pag. 79.

do it, and the effect of Gods grace helping vs in doing it: which grace *making vs partakers* (as S. Peter speaketh) *of deuine nature*, so dignifyeth our works, as (according to S. Paul) *we walke vvorthely of God, and become vvorthy of Gods kingdome.* And because Bel denyeth none of these Conclusions but the second and fieft, them only wil I proue.

1. Pet. 1. v. 4.
Coloss. 1. v. 10.
2. Thessal. 1. v. 5.

6. That good works are a condigne, or worthy merit of heauen in the sense before explicated, followeth of that they are a true merit therof, because as I thinke only condigne merit is true merit. For congrual merit hath no iustice in it (as appeareth in good works disposing to iustification, which some cal congrual merits) and therfore no true merit, which can not be without some title of iustice. But I proue it other waies: First because the Thessalonians suffered to be made or accounted worthy of Gods kingdom 2. Thess. 1. v. 5. Ergo: sufferances make men worthy or (which commeth to one purpose) to be truly accounted worthy of Gods kingdom. Secondly. Apocalip. 3. v. 4: *They haue not defyled their garments, and they shal vvalke vvith me in vvhite, because they be vvorthy* Ergo: Saints are worthy to walke with God in glory. These places make Protestants confesse that Saincts are worthy of heauen, but haue a shift of saying *They are vvorthy*

S. Paul. *Eis to catazioothenai humas.*

Apocal.

worthy for Christs merits, not for their owne. But as plainly as S. Paule affirmeth the Thessalonians to be worthy of Gods kingdome, so plainly he affirmeth their worthines to come of their owne sufferances. And likewise S. Ihon ascribeth the worthines of Saints, to their not defyling their garments, which is their owne merit. Moreouer Christ speaking of mans labours, saith. The worker is worthy of his hyer Luc. 10. v. 7. And we worke our saluation. Philip. 2. v. 12. And S. Austin epist. 105. saith that *Eternal life is giuen to the merit of our iustice, as death is to the debt of our sinne, and that God crowneth our merits.* And in psal. 93. that *We buy heauen with labour.* Therfore the worthines of Saints proceedeth from their owne merits, though it proceed also from the merits of Christ. For we are *branches, he the vyne,* & therfore as grapes, which spring out of the branches, proceed from the vyne, which giueth them their vertue: soe al worthines, which proceedeth from Saints, riseth from Christ as the roote and fountaine thereof.

Perkins refor. Cathol. *Of merits.* p. 113. S. Luke. S. Paul. S. Austin. Ioan. 15. 7. 5.

7. Thirdly: condigne merit requireth not perfect, and arithemetical equality in the worke to the rewarde, but only proportion: but good workes haue proportion to glory. Therfore they are condigne merits

thereof: The Propoſition Bel him ſelfe pag. 77. alleadgeth, and approueth out of Ihon de Combis, and it is euident in mens deſerts of a Biſhopricke, which being a ſpiritual dignity paſſeth al price, and yet may be worthely deſerued of men: The aſſumption shal be proued a none. Nether is our condigne meriting of heauen either blaſphemous againſt Gods free mercy, or iniurious to Chriſts merits, as Bel bableth, but rather honourable. For though eternal life, as it is giuen to good workes, be mercy, or grace, (as S. Paul calleth it) yet neuer shal Bel proue, that it is meere mercy, or grace. Our Sauiour calleth it a *reward*, and ſaith *we get it by violence*. S. Ihon according to S. Auſtins expoſition calleth it grace for grace, that is, grace of glory not abſolutly, but for grace of merits, or grace mixt with iuſtice. S. Paul calleth it a goale, a crowne of iuſtice. The Fathers cal it a ſtipend, a debt. And by whoſe authority then doth Bel cal it a meere grace, or mercy. Harken to S. Paul. 1. Timoth. 6. Bel, and leaue theſe ſame nouelties of wordes.

Infra parag. 9.

Bel pag 61.
Rom. 6. v. 23.
Math. 5. v. 12.
Math. 11. v. 12.
Ioan. 1. v. 16.
S. Auſtin. epiſt. 105.
Philip. 3. v. 14.
2. Timoth. 4. v. 8.
S. Auſtin ep. 105.
S Ambroſ. in c. 6 Rom.
S. Chryſoſt. hom. 7. Rom.
S. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. 3. in S. lauacrum.

8. Likewiſe it is not iniurious to Chriſts merits but rather honourable to them. For as it is not iniurious to Gods doing good, that we by his grace do good for our ſelfs, but rather honourable according to our Sauiours

Our merits honourable to Chriſt.

Sauiours saying. *In hoc clarificatus est pater &c.* In this my father is glorifyed: Nor to Christs prayer, or impetration, that we also through him pray and impetrate for our selfs: So likewise it is not iniurious to Christs meriting, but rather honourable therto, that we also through him, and as his liuely members do in some sort merit for our selfs. What iniury is it to the tree that the branch thereof bringeth forth fruit: nether are we therfore more partners with Christ in merit, then we are by prayers partners with him in impetration. *Ioan. 15. v. 8.*

Our merits no more iniurious to Christs merits then our prayer to his prayer.

9. That our merits haue proportion, and vertual equality to their reward followeth also out of the former. For condigne merit requireth at lest due proportion to the reward, but especially I proue it. First becaufe the reward consisteth in the cleare sight of God face to face, and in perfect loue of him, and our merit consisteth principally in faith which is a sight, or knowledge of God in a glasse, and in louing him aboue al things. But there is due proportion between the sight of a thinge in a glasse, and the cleare sight thereof, and betwixt perfect loue, and the loue aboue al things: Ergo: Secondly good workes are fruits of the holy Ghost. Galat. 5. v. 22. and of Christs passion: for by it we do these

Merits haue proportion to glory.

good workes. Ergo it is iniury to the holy Ghoſt, and to Chriſt to ſay that their ſupernatural fruits haue no proportion to a ſupernatural rewarde. Thirdly glory is grace: Rom. 6. Ioan. 1. and our merits are grace, but there is proportion between two graces: 4. Grace is the ſeed of glory according to that 1. Ioan. 3. *The ſeed of God remaineth in him*, therfore in vertue it conteineth glory as the ſeed doth the tree: 5. Glory is a floode making glad the citty of God pſal. 45. and grace is a fountaine of water leaping into eternal life. Ioan. 4. but there is proportion between a floode and a fountaine which ſpringeth into the place of the floode. Now let vs come to Bels arguments, which beſide that they impugne no matter of faith as is before ſaid, they diſproue no ſuch condignity of merit as Catholiques teach, and is already explicated, but ſuch as is both abſolute, and perfectly equal to the rewarde. And at laſt after he had runne him ſelfe out of breath, confeſſeth that he can not impugne condigne merit as it is defended by Bellarmin, who in truth teacheth no other herein then is the common doctrine of the Church.

CHAP.

CHAP. IIII.

Bels arguments out of Scripture against condigne merit answvered.

HIs first argument is taken out of S. Paul Rom. 6. v. 23. *To de Charisma tou theou Zoe aionios en Christo Iesou to curio hemon*: which he citeth in greeke perhaps to make the Reader beleeue he hath great skil in that tongue though the wordes be in his booke neither accented nor printed right; but remitting this fault to the printer, the text he englisheth thus: *But the gift of God is life euerlasting in Christ Iesus our lorde* and then argueth in this manner. Eternal life is the free gift of God, therfore it can be no way due to the merit of mans workes. *Bel pag. 61.*

2. Answer: First the consequent seemeth opposite to this other proposition of his: pag. 77. *Eternal life is due to the workes of Gods elect.* Secondly the Antecedent is false, and neither here, nor any where els taught by S. Paul. He calleth here eternal life grace, as it may be called for diuers causes: 1. because God gratiously couenanted with vs to giue it as a rewarde of our good workes, which (we being his slaues by creation) he might haue exacted of vs without any rewarde at al. This is S. Thomas his reason: *Foure reasons why eternal life is grace.* 1. S. Thomas.

2. 1. 2. q. 114. art. 2. 2. becauſe the workes them ſelues for which God giueth vs life eternal, were freely giuen vnto vs by Gods grace. This is S. Auſtins reaſon epiſt. 105.

S. Auſtin.

3. 3. becauſe the workes haue no perfect actuall equality to eternal life, but only virtuall, and proportionate, and this reaſon giueth Theodoret. in cap. 6. Rom. where he ſaith that temporal paines, and eternal ioyes *in æquilibrio non reſpondent*, and Bel falſly tranſlateth, *are nothing anſwerable*. 4. becauſe as workes are rewarded euen aboue their virtuall and proportionate equality as Deuines ſay *Vltra condignum*. No maruel if S. Paul called eternal life rather grace, or gift, then a ſtipend, ſeeing it hath much more of grace then it hath of iuſtice: yet notwithſtanding he no where called it meere grace, yea in calling it *a reward, a goale, and crowne of iuſtice* he clearly declareth that it is no meere grace, nor free gift: beſide that as S. Auſtin writeth epiſt. 105. he might haue called it a ſtipende as he calleth death in reſpect of ſinne, but forbore leſt we ſhould thinke it were ſo iuſtly deſerued by good workes, as death is by cuil. And perhaps he called it ſo in the next verſe before, where he calleth eternal life in greeke *telos*, which as Beza confeſſeth may there ſignify *vectigal* or *mercedem*, and is equiualent to ſtipend.

Theodoret.

Bel pag. 63. Fals tranſlation. 4.

4.

1. Cor. 3. Philip 3. v. 14. 2. Timoth. 4. v. 8.

S. Paul might haue called glory a ſtipend.

S. Auſtin.

Beza Rom. 6.

3. Not-

3. Notwithstanding this, Bel exclaimeth against the Rhemists that *they translated Charisma grace in steed of gift, for to extenuate the clearnes of this text*: wherin he sheweth his malice, and folly. For malice it is to accuse men to corrupt Scriptures of set purpose, and to bring no proofe therof, yea to confesse (as he doth) that *they follow the auncient vulgar edition*, of which S. Hierom was either Author, or amender. And folly it is, to condemne that translation as done for to extenuate the clearnes of Scripture, and withal to confesse (as he doth) that it is according to the olde vulgar edition, and that it may be here admitted, and to approue an other translation of Donation or Gift (which maketh no more for his purpose then Grace, which him selfe in the next page englisheth Free grace,) and finally to alleadge in his owne behalfe Theodoret. S. Chrisostom, Origen, Ambros, Theophilact and Paul of Burges, whoe al in the very places which he citeth for him selfe, read as the Rhemists translate grace, though some of them explicate it by Gift, as it is indeed, though no free gift. *pag. 62.* In cap. 6. ad Rom.

4. But let vs heare why the Rhemists did not wel translate the worde *Charisma* by Grace. *Because* (saith he) *it signifieth a gift freely bestowed.* If so Syr, why did not you, your Bel sup. Perkins refor. Cathol. p. 107.

Bibles printed by Barker. 1584.

mates, and your Bibles so translate it, but absolutly by gift. So you condemne other, and commit your selfe the like fault. Remember what S. Paul saith to such Rom. 2. But how proueth he *Charisma* to signify a Gift freely giuen. Forsooth *autos ephe* This great Grecian hath said it contrary to the Lexicons made and printed by Protestants, who make *Charisma* al one with *Charis*, and to signify Grace, or gift without mention of Free gift; contrary to the old vulgar translation, contrary to the vniforme reading of Fathers, contrary to his owne, and his fellows translations. Are these your cleare and euident demonstracions, which shal be able to put al Papists (as you promise) to silence for euer in this behalfe?

Lexicon Grynæi Basileæ. 1539. vvho citeth Budæus. Lexicon Gesneri auctũ per Arlenium, Iunium, Hartengum, Basileæ.

pag. 62.

5. *Novv* (saith he) *let vs vievve the iudgement of holy Fathers vpon this text.* With a good wil Syr; But marke good Readers how the Fathers are holy, their wordes are golden, their mouthes golden, and them selfes glistering beames and strong pillers of Gods Church, when they seeme to make for Bel, who otherwise amongst Protestants are but plaine Austin, and Hierom, and their doctrine stubble, errors, spottes, & blemishes: Likewise when Popish writers seeme to fauour Bel, they are with him famous, re-

See Bel p. 62. 64. 65. 71. 75. 67. 59. 104. 432.

now-

nowned, zealous, great ſchoole doctors, great Clerks indeed, whoe other whiles are but paraſites, and dunces.

6. Firſt he produceth out of Theodoret in c. 6. Rom. that *S. Paul did not cal here eternal life a reward, but grace, becauſe it is the gift of God, and al our labours are not of equal poiſe vnto it.* This is nothing againſt vs who neither ſay that S. Paul did in this verſe cal eternal life a reward, nor deny that it is the gift of God, nor affirme, that our labours are of equal poiſe vnto it. Next he produceth S. Chriſoſtom in c. 6. Rom. writing, that *The Apoſtle called not eternal life a reward, but grace* (as Brixius tranſlateth) or gift, (as Bel hath) *to ſhew that they were deliuered not by their owne ſtrength, nor that there is debt, reward, or retribution of labour, but that al thoſe things came by Gods grace, or* (as Bel hath) *they receaued them freely by Gods gift.* Here S. Chriſoſtom at the firſt ſight ſeemeth to deny eternal life to be a reward or retribution of good workes, which is not only contrary to Scripture Gen. 15. 2. paralip 15. prouerb. 11. pſal. 118. Sapient 5. Eccleſ. 18. Iſai. 40. Math. 5. 1. Corinth. 3. Apoca. vlt. v. 12. but euen to him ſelfe hom. 43. in 1. Corinth. ſaying, that *We ſhal haue perfect reward, and moſt ful retribution not only for the good we do, but alſo for the euil we ſuffer.* And hom. 1. de Reſur.

pag. 62. Theodoret.

S. Chryſoſt. p. 63.

Geneſ. 7 1. *Prouerb.* 7. 18. 2. *Paralip.* 7. 7. *Sap.* 7. 16. *Eccl.* 7. 22. *Iſai.* 7. 10. *Math.* 7. 12. 1. *Corinth.* 7. 8. S. Chryſoſt.

Resur. tom 3. *What care* (saith he) *will he haue of vertue, who expects no retribution of labours*: And hom. 15. in Math. that we haue God our debtor, when we do any good, and may exact vsury of him. And the like speeches he hath hom. 3. and 36. in Math. and 42. in Gen. and in Philog. and other where, which alone might assure vs, that he meaneth not to deny eternal life to be a true reward of our supernatural labors. But ether by labors he vnderstandeth natural labors done (as he speaketh there) *by our owne strēgth*, of which labors doubtles eternal life is is no reward, debt, or retribution. Or rather, by eternal life he there vnderstood not heauenly glory, but only iustificatiō, which he may cal eternal life, because it causeth eternal life, as our Sauiour for the same
3. Ihon. cause calleth faith so, Iohn 17. v. 3. and for the contrary sinne is called death, and this doubtles is no reward, debt, or retribution of any labour at al of ours. That this is his meaning I proue it: 1. because he saith eternal life was called grace to shew that they were not deliuered &c. Therfore by eternal life he vnderstandeth some thing, which had deliuered the Romans already from some thing vz. from sinne 2. because he saith that they, to whom S. Paul wrote had receaued that eternal life, wherof he speaketh but

but they being yet aliue had not receaued eternal glory, but only iuſtification. And S. Chriſoſtom being thus expounded ſpeaketh not againſt him ſelfe other where, nor againſt Scripture, and truth.

7. Thirdly he cyteth Origen ſaying. *Deum vero non erat dignum militibus ſuis ſtipendium quaſi debitum aliquod dare, ſed donum, & gratiam, quæ eſt vita æterna*: which Bel thus engliſheth. But it was not a thing worthy beſeeming God to giue ſtipends to his ſoldiers, as a due debt or wage, but to beſtow on them a gift, or free grace, which is eternal life. Here Bel tranſlateth *donum* a gift, and *gratiam* free grace, albeit before he preferred the word *donatio* which is al one in this matter with *donum*, before *gratia*, becauſe it better inſinuateth the freenes of the gift. But if you aske him wherfore he tranſlateth *gratia*, free grace, he can giue no better reaſon then his Grandſier Luther did when he tranſlated *fides iuſtificat*, faith alone iuſtifyeth vz: *Sic volo, ſic iubeo, ſtat pro ratione voluntas*. As for Origen he meaneth nothing els, but that it beſeemed not God to giue a ſtipend ſo due to good works, *as* (ſaith he) *the king of ſinne payeth ſtipends due to them, that obey his tyranny, which is moſt true*. For although the iuſt by good works deſerue life, yet not ſo iuſtly, as the wicked by ſinne deſerue

Bel pag. 63. Origen. in c. 6. ad Rom.

Falſe tranſlat. A. 5.

Surius Ann. 1550.

S. Auſtin ep. 105. to. 2. S. Anſelm. Rom. 6.

XUM

ſerue death, nether is life ſo due to them, as death to theſe, as is euident by what hath bene ſaid before, and Willet in affirming vs to teach the contrary sheweth a trick of his Miniſtery.

Willet controu. 17. q. 3. art. 3. p. 587.

8. S. Ambroſe he alſo alleadgeth, but his words are rather againſt him, for he ſaith. *As the followers of ſinne get death, ſo the followers of Gods grace, that is the faith of Chriſt, which forgiueth ſinnes shal haue eternal life.* What is here for Bel, or rather not againſt him. But moſt clearly doth S. Ambroſe confound Bel immediatly before the words cyted. *VVho from hence forth* (ſaith he) *abſteine from ſinne receaue a ſtipend eternal life.* And ſerm. 7. in pſal. 118. affirmeth that Dauid could ſay to God *I am a ſouldier, I exact a ſtipend of my captaine.*

pag. 63. S. Ambroſ. Rom. 6.

S. Ambroſ.

9. He citeth alſo Theophilact becauſe he ſaith *S. Paul called eternal life grace, and not a reward, as if he should ſay, for ye receaue not rewards of labours, but al theſe things are done by grace in Chriſt Ieſus, who worketh, and doth them.* But this is nothing againſt vs, who willingly acknowledge eternal life to be grace, and not to proceed of our owne labours done by our ſelfs, but done and wrought alſo by the grace of Chriſt: After this he citeth Anſelme, and Photius but alleadgeth not their words; yet confeſſeth that in effect

Theophilact. Rom. 6.

fect they are the ſame with others, and therfore ſeeing S. Anſelme vpon this place of S. Paul teacheth plainly that eternal life is a ſtipend of iuſtice, and that S. Paul might haue called it ſo, we may be aſſured that in effect other Fathers do cal it ſo, as he after S. Ambros and S. Auſtin doth in expreſſe words. Wherfore vainly doth Bel boaſt *that it is manifeſt by the foreſaid teſtimonies of holy Fathers that eternal life is the free gift of God*, for rather the quite contrary is manifeſt, becauſe none of them ſay it is a free gift, or any thing whereof it may be iuſtly inferred, and ſome of them expreſly ſay it is a ſtipend, and ſuch a one as a ſouldier may exact of his captaine, ſuch as death is to ſinne, which are euidently no free gifts. Wherfore to helpe vp this matter he addeth theſe wordes of Paulus Burgenſ. *He would not therfore ſay eternal life is the ſtipend of iuſtice, becauſe the ſame merits, to which it is rendred are not of our ſelfs, but wrought in vs by God through grace.* Theſe words, make not any thing for him, but rather againſt him. For in that he ſaith, eternal life is rendred to merits, he inſinuateth it to be no free grace, and in ſaying S. Paul choſe rather to cal it grace, then ſtipend, inſinuateth that he might haue called it a ſtipend, and in ſaying it is grace, becauſe it is repaid to merits, which

S. Anſelme.

S. Auſtin ep. 105. S. Ambroſ. Rom. 6. *Bel pag. 64. vntruth 60*

Vt Retributionem non vt gratiam ſed plane debitum occupas. S. Greg. Nazianz. orat. 3. in ſanctum lauacrum. Burgenſ. addit. 2. in c. 6. Rom.

we do

we do by grace, he affirmeth it to be partly grace, which no Catholique denyeth.

10. The second text of Scripture Bel bringeth out of Rom. 8 v. 18. and translateth thus: *I account that the afflictions of this present tyme are not worthy of the future glory:* Answer: Here is euil translation: for where the Apostle saith afflictions, are *Non condigna ad futuram gloriam ouc axia pros ten mellousan doxan*, are not condigne to the future glory Bel translateth: are not worthy of the future glory. And the Apostles meaning is not to tel there whether sufferances of this life be condignely meritorious, of future glory or no, but intendeth to say that they are not comparable to future glory ether in greatnes, or in continuance which hindereth not their condigne merit, as is euident in Christs sufferances. For hauing immediatly before said, that we shal be coheirs with Christ, if we suffer with him, lest we should be vnwilling to attaine to such glory by sufferance he addeth in the verse cited, *that sufferances are not condigne,* (that is, not comparable in greatnes, or continuance) *to future glory.* which meaning of his he vttereth in plainer tearms: 2. Corinth. 4. v. 17. saying *our tribulation which presently is momentary, and light, worketh above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory in*

False translat. 6.

7. 17.

S. Paul.

vs. Where he ſaith our tribulations are momentary, and light, and the glory is eternal, and weighty, which he meant when he ſaid here, they are not condigne to future glory. And hereby are explicated the words both of Theodoret, and S. Anſelme vpon this place. For Theodoret ſaying the *Crovvns exceed the conflicts, and the labour is not comparable to the revvard* compareth them not in the reſpect of deſert, and reward, but in greatnes of paine, and pleaſure: *for* (ſaith he) *the labour is litle, and the gaine great.* And the ſame compariſon in bitternes of paine and greatnes of pleaſure made S. Anſelm when he ſaid. *Al the bitterneſſes of al the paines of this life should not be a digne merit to future glory*: For doubtles the bitternes of al the paines of this life is not ſo great, as the pleaſure of heauēly ioyes. But this worthy Champion who challengeth al Papiſts to combat, sheweth him ſelfe ignorāt in tranſlating Theodorets words. *Superant certamina coronæ*: thus: *The conflicts of the crovvne remaine*; taking the nominatiue caſe for the accuſatiue, and the genitiue for the nominatiue, and perhaps *ſuperant*, for *ſuperſunt* both contrary to the latine, and to ſenſe. For who heard of conflicts of a crowne, or that conflicts remaine in heauen. Surely this challenger should rather be ſet to ſchoole to learne latine then to chal-

S. Anſelm. Rom. 8.

Bel vvanteth latin.

to challenge Deuines to disputation, rather taught to construe the Fathers, then to dispute out of them. But as S. Hierome wrote epist. ad Euagr. *Imperitia confidentiam parit.* None so bold as blinde Bayard.

S. Hieron.

Bel pag. 65.

11. The third text he cyteth is out of S. Paul Tit. 3. v. 5. *Not by vvorks of iustice, which we haue done, but according to his mercy he hath saued vs by the lauer of regeneration, and renouation of the holy Ghost. By which vvords* (saith Bel) *it is most cleare that we are not only iustifyed, but also saued by meere mercy, and consequently eternal life hath no merit vpon the behalfe of man.* Omitting that before our good works were merit in a godly sense, & now there is no merit on mans behalfe: I answer, that the Apostle meaneth only of sauing from sinne. vz iustification. First because speaking of him selfe, and others then aliue he saith *God hath saued vs*: Secondly because hauing said in the third verse. *VVe vvere somtymes vnwise incredulous &c.* he addeth v. 5. and *God according to his mercy hath saued vs*, vz. from the foresaid sinnes. Thirdly because explicating by what means God had saued them, he saith it was *by the lauer of regeneration, and renouation of the holy Ghost*, which most plainly expresseth iustification. And no doubt but saluation from sinne proceedeth of Gods meere mercy but this is not to the purpose. And of this

salua-

ſaluation ſpeaketh S. Anſelme vpon this place, whoſe words Bel curtailed leauing out theſe words, *By the laue of regeneration, and renouation of the holy Ghoſt, that is, by baptiſme*, becauſe they clearly shew of what ſaluation this holy Saint did meane. And of the ſame meant Dioniſ. Carthuſ. vpon this place as is plaine by his explicating what the ſaluation was, vz. *from powre of the Dyuel, and guilt of eternal torment*. And thus much of Bels firſt reaſon out of Scripture now to his arguments out of Fathers. Carthuſ.

CHAP. VI.

Bels arguments out of holy Fathers againſt condigne merit anſwered.

S. Auſtin he alleadgeth epiſt. 29. ad Hieron, whoſe words I wil ſet downe at large that the Reader thereby may ſee how falſly Bel auoucheth him to confirme his doctrine. *Charity* (ſaith he) *is a vertue, with which we loue that, which is to be loued. This is great in ſome, in others les, in others none at al, but moſtful charity, which can be no more encreaſed, is in none, whiles a mã lyueth here, but whiles it may be encreaſed ſurely that which is les then it ſhould be, is ex vitio, of vice.* (Bel tranſlateth ſinne) *by reaſon of which vice there is no iuſt on earth, which doth good, and ſinneth not: by reaſon of* Bel pag. 66. S. Auguſtin. tom. 2.

Which vice no liuing man shal be iustifyed in Gods sight. For vvhich vice if vve say we haue no sinne we seduce our selfes, and there is no truth in vs. For which also though vve haue profited neuer so much, we must of necessity say Forgiue vs our trespasses, euen when our vvords, deeds, & thoughts are already forgiuen in baptisme.

pag. 67. vntruth 61

2. Hence Bel gathereth 1. *That S. Austin saith that no man can haue charity in that perfect degree which the lavv requireth.* This is vntrue: for he only saith, that no man hath in this life that most ful charity, which can not be encreased. 2. *That the want therof proceedeth of vice.* This is true, but of what kinde of vice he meant, him selfe had explicated a litle before in the same place: saying: *VVho therfore is without some vice, that is without some fomite, or as a roote of sinne.* Wherfore he meant not that the want of most ful charity proceedeth of formal sinne, but of that which is cause, and roote of sinne, to wit, concupiscence. And by this are answered al the rest of Bels notes out of this place. As that by reason of this vice euery man is a sinner, none iustified before God, if we say we haue no sinne we be lyers, we haue need to aske God forgiuenes euen after baptisme. For al these things are verifyed of Concupiscence, not formally but effectiuely, that is, Concupiscence (which S. Austin calleth vice, becaus

XUM

becauſe it is the roote, and cauſe of formal vice) cauſeth ſinne in vs, which ſinne maketh vs formally ſinners, not iuſtifyed before God, and to neede forgiuenes euen after baptiſme. And hereby are explicated the like words of S. Ambroſe which hereafter he citeth: *That by reaſon of the rebellion of the flesh that is vnderſtood of euery one, which S. Ihon ſaith. If we ſay we haue no ſinne we ſeduce our ſelfs.* *Bel pag. 68.* S. Ambroſ. epiſt. 84. to. 4. prope finem

3. But ſuppoſe that S. Auſtin had ſaid al that Bel inferreth, though it would proue Concupiſcence to be formal ſinne, yet would it not proue that our workes are no condigne merit, which is the queſtion now in hand. For though Concupiſcence were as Bel thinketh venial ſinne, which he art. 9. calleth ſinne not regnant, yet might other ſupernatural works of ours, as faith, hope, and charity be condigne merit. But Bel careth not how he ſpeaketh to the purpoſe ſo he ſay ſomw hat: Euen ſo in the former Article when he ſhould proue Concupiſcence to be ſinne, he proued our merits to be none, and now when he ſhould proue our merit to be none he proueth Concupiſcence to be ſinne: After this he citeth S. Auſtin ſaying tract. 4. in 1. Ioan. that *Our iuſtice of faith is imperfect.* Ergo ſaith Bel there is no condigne merit. wheras he ſhould *Bel forgetteth his matter.* *pag. 67.* S. Auguſtin. to. 9.

haue inferred the quite contrary. For if in vs there be imperfect iuſtice, there is iuſtice, and if there be iuſtice, there is condigne merit to that whereto we haue iuſtice. And the moſt that Bel could inferre for him ſelfe, is that there is no perfect condigne merit, which I willingly graunt: Albeit indeed S. Auſtin in that place calleth not our iuſtice imperfect, becauſe there is any thing wanting to it ſelfe, which is requiſit to iuſtice, for epiſt. 105. he calleth it true iuſtice, but becauſe we, who haue it, *delight in other things, and haue rebellion*, which things being ſeperated from it, *our iuſtice* (ſaith he) *ſhal be perfected* vz. not by any addition but by ſeperating our iniuſtice from the company of it.

S. Auguſtin. to. 2. Tract. 4. cit.

4. He citeth alſo S. Chriſoſtom affirming that *Though we dye a thouſand tymes, and accomplish al vertues of the mynde, yet do we nothing worthy to thoſe things, which ipſi percepimus, we haue receaued of God*: But beſides that S. Chriſoſtome ſpeaketh not of eternal glory, but of benefits of this life, which we (ſaith he) *haue receaued*, and Bel falſly engliſhed, *we receaue*. He is to be vnderſtood of perfect equality, or of works conſidered in their owne nature not as they proceed of grace, and are fruit of the holy Ghoſt. Next he alleadgeth Theophilacts words in c. 3. Tit.

Bel pag. 68. S. Chryſoſt. l 2. de compunction. cordis.

Falſe tranſlat. 7.

pag. 69.

Tit. *He hath saued vs for euer, not of works which we did, that is, neither did we works of iustice, neither by them are we saued, but al our saluation his goodnes, and clemency hath wrought.* But besides that these words I found not in that place, they may be vnderstood of saluation from sinne, vz. of iustification: as appeareth becaus the text which they expound, doth so meane, as is before proued, as also speaking of men aliue he saith *We are saued*, which he calleth saluation for euer, becaus iustification is such in hope, according to that Rom. 8. v. 24. *Spe salui facti sumus.* Theophilact. Cap. 4. parag. 11. f

5. Bel finding so few Fathers to speake any thing, to his purpose, thought best to supply the rest of this chapter with the words, of S. Bernard, and Angles, whom he confesseth to be Papists, though his Maister Caluin accounted S. Bernard a holy man, and his brother Perkins citeth him as a Father of the auncient Church such *rara est concordia fratrum Protestanticorum.* Angles he tearmeth a famous, and one of our best Doctors, though he be a very late, and meane writer, and of purpose impugned the Protestants. But let his handling of Angles be to the Reader an example and taste of his foule vsage of Fathers, and other writers. Bel pag. 69. 70. Caluin lib. 4. instit. cap. 7. parag 22. Perkins refor. Cathol. Of merits. p. 109. pag 70. Bel promiseth to yeeld if he haue charged any Author falsly. Preface of his challeng.

6. *Al other holy Doctors also* (saith Angles Angles 2. sent. p. 103.

according to Bels translation) *considering after the same manner, the natural valew only of good works, and perceauing that it is exceeding far distant from the valew, and iust estimation of eternal life said wisely. That our Works, are not meritorious of eternal life. Yet for the couenant and promise made vnto vs, the good Works of man with the helpe of Gods grace are worthy of eternal life, and equal with it, which for al that, that promise of God (which is frequent in the Scripture) set aside, were altogether vnworthy of so great reward.* Hereupon Bel auoucheth Angles to graunt that *al holy Fathers with one assent affirme* (a *testimony* (saith he) *almost incredible to proceed from the mouth of a Papist so deare to the Pope*) *That good Works nether are meritorious, nor worthy of eternal life.* And in the margent addeth this note: *Loe this fryer graunteth that al holy Fathers are against Papists.*

pag. 70.

vntruth 62

A taste of Bels false changing Authors.

7. But better may I say this is a slaunder almost incredible to proceed from the mouth of a Minister, if his ministery were not in lying. Angles said that *al holy Fathers affirme our good Works not to be meritorious of eternal life, according to their natural valew,* & the same al Catholiques now affirme. Is this absolutly to say, that al holy Fathers affirme good works are not meritorious? So thē, because one may say, that Bel according to his natural valew is no better then an infidel, an other

other may absolutly say, he is no better then an infidel, or rather worse, because *qui fidem negauit est infideli deterior*: This slaunder is so euident, as him selfe soone after is faine to cõfesse that Angles saith *The Fathers speake of good Works only in respect of their natural Valew.* So ill hath he learnt that first lesson of his occupation *mendacẽ oportet esse memorem.* His second note out of Angles is: that he graũteth good works cõsidered in their owne nature to be vnworthy of eternal life. This is true, & taught by vs before, & confirmed by S. Austin epist. 105. saying. *Nothing but grace maketh al our good Works.* Thirdly he noteth in Angles that he graunteth *good works euen as they proceed of grace are vtterly vnworthy of eternal life if Gods free promise, & acceptation be set a part.* True it is, that Angles, as a follower of Scotus, seemeth to thinke that the condignity of good works to eternal life, riseth not of any equality which is in them vnto glory but of Gods promise to reward them, which is a far different question from this, as is before explicated: yet withal in the very words cited he professeth them *to be,* (supposing the said promise, which is euery where founde in Scripture) *Worthy of eternal life and equal vnto it.* Let now any indifferent Reader iudge what face Bel had when vpon these words of Angles he wrote that

1. *Timoth.* 5. v. 8.

Contradict. 17.

pag. 70.

S. Augustin. to. 2.

Hæreticorum frons nõ est frons, si non membrum quod fecit Deus sed pudorem intelligas. Aug. 4. cont. Iul. c. 3. to. 7.

vntruth 63.

untruth 64 *Papists graunt as much as we* (Protestants) *desire. and that we* (Protestants) *defend nothing herein, but euen that which their owne best Doctors in their printed books do teach.*

Bel pag. 71. 8. Out of S Bernard he alleadgeth these
S. Bernard. words serm. 1. de annunt. *The suffering of this time are not condigne to future glory, no, not if one suffer al; For the merits of men are not such as eternal life is due to them ex iure,* (of iustice) *that God should do any iniury if he gaue it not.* Hereupon Bel inferreth diuers things, but al depend of his false vnderstanding the words iustice, and iniury. For S. Bernards meaning is only to deny, that al the sufferings of this life can be absolute, and perfect equal merit of glory, depending of no grace, or ptomise of God to reward them: but that God of his meere iustice, without al respect of mercy should be bound to repay them with eternal life, and otherwise should do absolute iniury. And meaneth not to deny that supposing Gods gratious promise of rewarding works, and assistance in doing them, heauen is due to them of some iustice, and that he should do some iniury if
S. Augustin. to. 7. he did not giue heauē. For as S. Austin saith l. 4. con. Iulian. c. 3. *God him selfe shal be vniust if the true iust be not admitted to his kingdome.*
S. Paul. Heb. 6. v. 10. And the same insinuateth S. Paul, when writing to the Hebrews he saith God is not vniust

vniuſt to forget their worke, as if he should do ſome iniuſtice, if he should forget it.

9. Next he citeth his words ſerm. 67. in Canti: *It wanteth to grace whatſoeuer thou aſcribeſt to merits. I will no merit vvhich excludeth grace. I abhorre vvhatſoeuer is of myne, vnles perhaps that is more myne vvhich maketh me myne owne, Grace reſtoreth me to my ſelfe freely iuſtifyed, and ſo deliuered from ſlauery of ſinne.* Here Bel noteth diuers things againſt al merit & auoucheth moſt falſly *S. Bernard to renounce al merit of man whatſoeuer.* Wheras the B. Saint ſpeaketh only againſt meere humaine merit, done by our owne powre without aſſiſtance of grace, ſuch ſaith he excludeth grace, and is of our owne. And ſuch indeed he and al Catholiques renounce, and leaue to the Pelagians, but willingly he accepteth ſuch merit as proceedeth from grace, and (as he ſpeaketh) maketh me myne owne. pag. 71. pag. 72. vntruth 65.

10. Laſtly he alleadgeth his words ſerm. 68. in Cant. *So there is no cauſe, vvhy thou ſhouldeſt novv aske by vvhat merits vve hope for goods, eſpecially ſeeing thou beareſt the Prophet ſaying. Not for you, but for me I vvil do it ſaith our Lord. It ſufficeth to merit, to know that merits ſuffice not. But as it ſufficeth to merit not to preſume of merits, ſo to vvant merits is enough to iudgement.* Bel inferreth that *the moſt ſufficiet merit in man is to knovv and confeſſe, that our merits are no merits indeed.* pag. 71. pag. 72. vntruth 66

indeed. Did euer honeſt man deale thus. S. Bernard ſpeaketh not of the moſt ſufficient merit, but only telleth what ſufficeth to a merit: vz. not to preſume of merits which no doubt is an act of humility, and a meritorious act. And leſt of al dreamed that our merits are no merits (yea plainly affirmeth that to want merits ſufficeth to be damned) but only telleth vs that our merits ſuffice not vz: without Gods mercy of pardoning our ſinnes, and gratious promiſe of rewarding them, which is only to deny abſolute, & perfect equal merit, which we alſo with him deny. But marke good Reader how
pag. 61. Bel, who before admitted our merits in a godly ſenſe, now plainly auoucheth them to be no merits, which plainly diſcryeth his godly ſenſe of expounding merit by Impetration, to be an vngodly ſhift of his for to delude the authorities of Fathers, expreſly auouching merit. And thus much of his proofs out of Fathers. Now let vs view his proofs out of Popiſh writers.

Chap. VI.

Bels arguments out of late Catholique vvriters againſt condigne merit anſvvered.

pag. 72. S. Thomas. THE firſt Papiſt which Bel citeth is S. Thomas 1. 2. 4. 114. ar. 1. *It is manifeſt that*

that betvveene God, and man, there is moſt great inequality, for there is infinit diſtance betvveene them, al the good vvhich is mans is from God, vvherfore mans iuſtice receaued of God can not be according to abſolute equality, but according to a certaine proportion, to vvit, in as much as ether vvorketh according to his manner. But the manner, and meaſure of humaine povvre in man is from God, and therfore mans merit before God can not bee but according to the ſuppoſal of Gods ordinance, to vvit, ſo that man obtaine of God by his vvorke that as a revvard, to vvhich God hath deſigned him povvre to vvorke. Hence Bel inferreth diuers things. 1. That *S. Thomas telleth vs that vvhere there is not perfect equality, there is no merit properly.* This is an vntruth properly, for Aquinas denyeth only merit or iuſtice according to abſolute equality, yea affirmeth that proportionate merit may be betwixt them that infinitly differ. 2. *That there is infinit inequality betvvixt God and man*: This is a needles note made only to fil roome, and make number. 3. *That mans iuſtice is not abſolute, but imperfect.* This is true, and we teach the ſame. But marke how he noteth this to be the doctrine of Aquinas, which a none he wil ſay is Proteſtantiſme.

pag. 73.

vntruth 67

2. That *Aquinas graunteth vvillingly that man doth merit nothing in Gods ſight ſaue only by vvay of his free acceptation.* This is an vntruth

vntruth 68

truth willingly tolde. For Aquinas only saith. *That man can not merit any thing of God, but only according to the presupposal of his ordinance*, that is, vnles God had promised, and ordeined to reward our merit, and graunteth (as is said) that we haue proportionate merit, and therfore only denyeth absolute merit: 5. *That Aquinas confesseth that eternal life is not properly hyre.* This is vntrue: For he only saith that it is *quasi merces* as a hyre, or reward, vnles Bel wil make S. Ihon to haue denyed Christ to be properly the sonne of his Father, when he said, *vve savv his glory as it vvere of the only begotten of his Father*. And though S. Thomas had said it were not properly hyre, his other words would enforce vs to vnderstād him not of al kinde of hyre, but only of such as is betweene equals, when one free man hyreth an other, for such doubtles can not be betwixt God, and man; nay it is not so perfect hyre, or iustice as may be betwixt a man, & his bondslaue, if he should liberally giue his slaue his labours, and promise to reward them as wel as if he were a free man: For though such a maister of liberality, both giue his slaue his labours, and promise to reward them, in which he is like to Gods dealing with vs, yet neither doth he giue his slaue powre to labour, nor assists him in his labour, nor rewardeth

vntruth 69

Ioan. 1. 7. 14.

Note this example.

1. 2. 3.

wardeth him aboue deſert of his labour, as God of his liberality doth with vs. And therfore our reward hath leſſe the nature of hyre then the wages of ſuch a ſlaue ſhould haue. And yet notwithſtanding it is not a free gift, as almes is to a beggar, or a benefit ſhould be to a ſlaue, if his Lord had not beſtowed his labours vpon him, & promiſed to reward them as if he were not his ſlaue. And hereby is reproued an other vntruth which Bel afterward auoucheth vpon S. Thomas: vz. *That he affirmeth that God is not ſaid ſimply and truly to be debtor vnto vs.* For the worde (*truly*) is by Bel vntruly added: And S. Thomas meaneth that he is not ſimply and abſolutly our debtor, but vpon preſuppoſal of his promiſe, and ordinance. *Bel pag. 76.* S. Thomas 1. 2. q. 114. art. 1. *vntruth 70*

3. Many lines he citeth out of Durand to proue that he denyed cõdigne merit, but omitted other immediatly before where Durand diſtinguisheth two kinds of merits *de condigno*, largely & ſtrictly ſo called. *Cõdigne merit largely called* (ſaith he) *is a certaine worthines, vvhich God requireth in the worke for to reward it vvith eternal life, and thus* (ſaith he) *vve haue.* and in theſe words which Bel citeth denyeth only that condigne merits *vvhich is* (ſaith he twiſe) *ſtrictly* (and this word Bel left twiſe out in his tranſlation) *Bel pag. 75.* Durand. 2. d. 27. q. 2. *Falſe tranſlat. 8.*

and

and properly so called, and is found betweene man, and man, & he defyneth it to be *a voluntary action, vvherby revvard is so due to the vvorke, as he to vvhom it appertaineth to give it, is simply, and properly vniust if he do not*: which kinde of condigne merit I also deny to be in our works. For nether is it strictly condigne, nor such as is betwixt man and man, nether should God be simply coniust if he did not reward it, as appeareth by what hath bene said before. But suppose that Durand had absolutly denyed al condigne merit in our works. What hath Bel gotten more then that one schooleman who hath many other singuler opinions, did in this matter, which is no point of faith, dissent from the common doctrine of Schools?

Bel pag. 375.

4. After this Bel auoucheth *Gregory of Arimino: Marsil: Thomas of VValden, Paul of Burges, and Eckius, to affirme very constantly, That mans works are not meritorious of eternal life.* But this he affirmeth very vntruly, and lest he should be tript would neither cite their words, nor quote the place. For no Catholique denyeth our supernatural works to be meritorious of eternal life, though Paul of Burges, in psalm. 35. deny them to be meritorious *de condigno* and Walden. tom. 3. de sacramentalibus c. 7. counselleth to absteine from the name *de condigno*, *& congruo*.

vntruths 71.

grno, yet he expreſly auoucheth our works to be meritorious. Gregory alſo confeſſeth them to be ſo meritorious as in reſpect of merit *de congruo* they may be ſaid to be meritorious *de condigno*: Marſilius, and Eckins books I had not at hand to peruſe, yet doubtles they denyed not our ſupernatural works to be meritorious, but either only to be meritorious *de condigno*, which (as I ſaid) is no point of faith, or els perhaps only to be abſolutly and perfectly meritorious *de condigno*, which I alſo do not deny. But I maruel why Bel would make mention of Eckins, whoſe very name bringeth to memory that he foyled Luther ſo in diſputation, as being admonished by the Counſellors of George Duke of Saxony to behaue him ſelfe modeſtly he cryed out. *This matter was nether begun for God, nor shal be ended for him.*

Gregor. 2. d. 17.

Sur. 1518.

Luthers abhominable wwords.

5. Next he produceth Sotus writing that perfect ſatisfaction requireth that the whole valew proceed from the debter without any fauour at al of the Creditor, and that there be a reſtoring of an equiualent thinge otherwiſe vndue. Whereupon Bel auoucheth him to teach, that *euery ſatisfaction requireth the like conditions.* This is manifeſtly falſe: for he ſpeaketh only of perfect ſatisfaction as was the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.

Sotus lib. 3. de nat. & Grat. c. 6.

Bel pag. 75. vnd truth 72

Christ. But to Bels argument framed hereupon. *None can satisfy for sinne, therfore none can condignely merit heauen:* I answer by distinguishing the Antecedent. If it be meant of sinne it selfe I graunt it, but deny the Consequence. And the difference is, because there can be no satisfaction at al, vnles the satisfyer be in Gods fauour, which can not be, vnles the sinne be already pardoned, and therfore al satisfaction supposeth sinne to bee forgiuen freely, but merit doth not so suppose eternal life to be already giuen. But if it be meant of temporal punishment, which is called sinne according to the Scriptures phrase Zachar. vlt. and oftentymes remayneth after the sinne it selfe is pardoned, as appeareth in Dauid Moyses, and others: I deny the Antecedent. For as Daniel said c. 4. we may redeeme our sinnes by almes, and by mercy prouerb. 16. And albeit this satisfaction be not so perfect, as it hath al the conditions which the perfection of satisfaction requireth, yet hath it al which the essence thereof exacteth. Nether doth Aristotle alleadged by Bel teach the contrary.

Zachar. 2. Reg. 12. v. 14. Deuter. 32. v. 51. Daniel. v. 24. Prouerb. v. 6.

Bel pag. 76. 6. After this becaus Angles (as I said before) seemeth to say that the condignity of our merit riseth only vpon the promise of God made to reward it Bel here a new

vntruth 73.

auou-

auoucheth him *to confeſſe plainly the ſelfe ſame doctrin which he intendeth to proue*, which how true it is hath bene already shewed, and withal addeth that *this is the maine point, and only foundation to which al Papiſts do, and muſt appeale in this queſtion.* And he reproueth this by the example of the loane of a cloake in a shower of raine vpon promiſe of an hundred pownds, notwithſtanding which promiſe (ſaith he) that loane can not be condigne merit of that price. But moſt falſe it is that Angles his reaſon is the maine or only foundation, to which al Papiſts doe and muſt appeale in this queſtion. For to it appeale only ſuch as follow Scotus. And S. Thomas 1. 2. q. 114. ar 3. Bonauent: 2. diſt: 17. Bellarm. l. 5. de iuſtif. c. 17. and Iohn: de Combis (as Bel him ſelfe teſtifyeth) with the beſt Deuines appeale to the vertual, and proportionate equality before explicated, which is already proued to be in our merits: And account that foundation of Angles vnſure, and inpugne it better then Bel doth with his example of the loane of a cloake which maketh nothing againſt vs. For it hath not ſuch vertual, and proportionate equality to an hundred pownds, as our merits haue to glory. I omit Bels fonde inferring, that we do not condignly deſerue eternal life if (as Deuines ſay) *God re-*

Cap. 5. parag. 7.

vntruth 74

Bel pag. 77.

Bel diſproueth him ſelf.

ward vs vltra condignum aboue our deserts.

Deuines in 4. sent. d. 46. For it only proueth that we doe not condignly deserue that excesse of glory, which

S. Luke. God wil giue vs, when as Christ saith Luc. 6. v. 38. He wil giue *good measure, and pressed downe, and shaken together, and running ouer.* And rather proueth that we doe condignly deserue some degree of glory. For if God rewarde vs *vltra condignum*, beyond our deserts he rewardeth vs according to our deserts, and more two.

pag. 77. 7. Likewise he citeth Lyra saying that

Lyra in c. 3. Tit. *Eternal saluation wholy exceedeth the power of mans nature: Therfore he can not attaine vnto it but by liberality of gods mercy.* True: But what? becausse it exceedeth the power of mans nature, wil Bel haue it also to exceede the power of Gods grace in which according to

Philip. 4. v. 13. S. Paul we cã doe al thinges: Or becausse we need Gods liberality vz. for to haue his promise of reward; his grace, and to haue the good works, therfore can we not haue his

2. Timoth. 4. v. 8. iustice to giue (as S. Paul speaketh) a crowne of iustice for our works, and consummation of our race? Are Gods liberality and iustice so opposite, as they can not concurre to one worke? Why then did the Psalmist

Psalm. 100. v. 1. sing psal: 100. *Iudgment and mercy* to God? This Bel would; & therfore when lyra said

9. False translat. *nisi ex largitate diuinæ misericordiæ* Bel englished

shed him, *But only by the liberality of Gods mercy.* adding, *only*, of his owne ſtore. And albeit Carthuſianus profeſſe that merits are not excluded, yet Bel beggeth his fauour, becauſe he writeth that *Eternal life is ſaid to be giuen as reuvarde by grace, and principally attributed to grace, becauſe God reuvardeth vi vltra condignum.* Who pittieth not this poore beggar, who is faine to goe to his enemyes dores a begging that, which wil doe him no good, and now and then is faine to ſteale. I haue giuen him more before, let him take that, and be thankful, and try what thereof he can gather againſt ſuch cõdigne merit as Catholiques defend. Carthuſ. in c.6.Rom. *Bel left out thu. For the Elect by Grace deſerue eternal life.*

8. But wil you ſee this braue champion challenger, who hitherto hath ſownded Alarme, and fought furiouſly againſt condigne merit, now at the end of this Article ſounding a Retreit, and confeſſing that, that condigne merit which Catholiques defend is too good for him to deale withal. After he had cited out of Bellarmin, that our merits are not condigne of iuſtice abſolutly, but *poſita liberali Dei promiſſione* ſuppoſing Gods liberal promiſe, (which Bel falſly tranſlateth in reſpect of Gods liberal promiſe.) And that abſolutly a man can not exact any thinge of God, ſeeing al are his, but only ſuppoſing his wil, and coue- *Bel recanting p.79.* Bellarm. lib. 5. de iuſtific. c.16. 10. *Falſe tranſlat.*

nant, that he wil not exact our works of vs for nothing, but giue vs reward according to the proportion of our works. As a ſlaue (ſaith he) can not abſolutly demaund any thing of his maiſter, ſeeing al the ſlaue getteth he getteth to his maiſter, yet if it pleaſe his maiſter to beſtow his works vpon him, and to promiſe reward for them, as if they were not due to him, the ſlaue may iuſtly demaũd reward for them, Bel I ſay, after he had cited theſe words out of Bellarmin, and affirmed that Bellarmin taught this after mature conſultation with the beſt learned Ieſuits, and the Pope him ſelfe telleth vs that *Bellarmin maketh good his doctrine in them, and that if he, and his fellowes, and followers would ſtand conſtantly to their owne doctrine, which they publish in printed books, we* (Proteſtants) *and they ſhould ſoone agree, and theſe controuerſies would haue an end.*

The Tridentin Councel defyned only that we truly deſerue heauen, and Bel impugneth it.

9. What is this but in plaine tearms to confeſſe, that he can not impugne Bellarmins printed doctrine of condigne merit, which is the very ſame which al Catholiques commonly print, preach, and beleeue. For Bellarmin in the very words cited ſaith. A man may *ex iure iuſtly demaund reward at Gods hands for his works:* that *our merits are ex iuſtitia ſuppoſing Gods promiſe:* and that *God rewardeth them ſecundum proportionem* according

ding to their proportion. And affirmeth in the next chapter to theſe words that *good vvorkes are condignely meritorious of eternal life by reaſon of the couenant, and vvorke together, not that a good vvorke ſhould not haue proportion to eternal life vvithout the couenant, but becauſe God is not bound to recompence the vvorke vvith that revvard, albeit it be iuſt, and equal to the revvard, vnles he before had couenanted.* Doe you holde Syr this printed doctrine of Bellarmin, doth it like you? ſpeake plainly and renounce your meere accepration, and bare impetration, and be not aſhamed to ſay *deuterai phrontides ſophotatai*: for your ſecond faith was beſt. Sup. cap. 17.

10. But he meaneth nothing les, then to holde Bellarmins printed doctrine, *vvhich* (ſaith he other where) *is approued by the Pope, vvho hath ſaid al that can be ſaid for Popery, and vvhoſe teſtimony alone is moſt ſufficient in al Popiſh affairs*. But only by occaſion of his owne foreſaid falſe tranſlation he hoped to make his Reader beleeue that Bellarmin helde condignity of merit to ariſe meerly of Gods promiſe, which though he did (as ſome Catholiques doe) belonged not to this queſtion as is before declared, and rather ſuppoſeth, then denyeth condigne merit. Yet is it defended of the ſame Catholiques in a farre different ſenſe as pag. 26. 125. 87. And p 29. The Ieſuits (Bellarmin) doctrin is the Popes owne doctrin.

Sup. c 17. Bellarmin him ſelfe sheweth then of Proteſtants. For they thinke our ſupernatural workes to be truly good, and condignely to deſerue ſome reward, though not ſo great as eternal life is, vnles God had promiſed it to them: But Proteſtants thinke them to be truly naught, and ſinne, and to deſerue no reward, but punishment, and that God in accepting, and rewarding them accepteth, and rewardeth ſinne, which is a horrible blaſphemy contrary to Scripture, auouching that he hateth ſinne, contrary to his goodnes, that can not accept naughtines, and ſinne, more then fyer can water, and contrary to his iuſtice, which can not reward it.

Prouerb. 6. 7. 16. Pſal 5. 7. 7. Sapient. 14. 7 9. Apocal. 2. 7. 6. Iudith 5. 7. 21. Pſalm. 44. 7 8.

11. After al this Bel alleadgeth a ſaying of S. Auſtin *VVoe euen to the laudable life of man, if thou diſcuſſe it ſetting thy mercy aſide:* which maketh litle to the purpoſe. For S. Auſtin denounceth not woe to good mens merits, which otherwhere he ſaith are great matters, and to be crowned, but to the men them ſelfs, becauſe as they haue merits to be crowned, ſo they haue demerits to be punished, which if they were punished without mercy, woe should be to them: Not becauſe they should be ſent to hel, but to purgatory, or (as he calleth it ſermon. in pſalm. 37.) *Emendatory fyer*, and there

Bel pag. 80. S. Auguſtin. lib. 9. Confeſſ. c. 13. L. 2. de Gen. cõt. Manich. c. 14. L. 1. de nupt. & concupiſ. c. 29. Serm. 5. de verb. Apoſt.

S. Auſtin.

there punished without mercy, which fyer (saith he) *is more greeuous then any thinge, Vvhich man can suffer in this life*. And to procure Gods mercy in this behalfe to his mothers soule he both prayed him selfe, and requested others to pray for her. Be mynd-ful therfore (Bel) from whence thou art fallen, and do penance. Apocal. 2. Confess. lib. 9. c. 13. cit.

THE SIXT ARTICLE OF THE DISTINCTION OF MORTAL AND VENIAL SINNES

CHAP. I.

The true Distinction proued and Bels obiection answered.

BEL perceauing that Catholiques do euidently proue that there is a difference betweene mortal, and venial sinnes durst not deny it, but proceedeth as he did in the former Article, allowing in words the distinction of mortal, and venial sinnes in a godly sense, which though he be ashamed to expresse, yet doth he insinuate in other tearms of regnant, & not regnant, and meaneth (as I suppose) that voluntary euil acts are mortal, & inuoluntary venial, which doctrine is already disproued in the fourth article. Wherfore here he vndertaketh to proue that euery sinne is mortal of it owne nature, and some become venial only for free acceptation, & mercy of God.

Bel pag. 81.

Bel admitteth venial sinnes.

2. Sup-

2. Supposing therfore that some sinnes are mortal, and others venial, I intend to proue by Scripture, Fathers, and reason, that they are such of their owne nature. The Scripture compareth such sinnes as are mortal, and venial to things, which of their owne nature are different as Math. 23. to a Camel, and a gnat. Luc. 6. to a strawe, and a beame: Ergo: these kinde of sinnes are different of their owne nature. Likewise our Sauiour Luc. 12. 58. compareth some sinnes to mites or farthings, which of their nature are smal debts. Moreouer God hath no where reuealed that some kinde of sins become venial only by his mercy. Therfore we ought not to say so. The Consequence is euident. for none knoweth the pleasure of God but by his reuelation. The Antecedent I proue: for Protestants can neither name the sinnes, which God hath made venial, nor the place, where God hath reuealed any such making of his. Bel citeth Math. 12. v. 3. where it is said, that *We shal giue account of euery idle word.* And 1. Iohn. 3. v. 4. where sinne is called iniquity. But in neither place it is said that Gods mercy maketh any sinne venial, and other like places cited by other Protestants rather proue that al sinnes notwithstãding Gods mercy are now mortal, then that any, which of them selfe were mortal,

Mortal and venal sinnes are such of their owne nature.

Math. 23. 7. 24. Luc. 6. 7. 42.

Math. 5. 7. 27.

mortal, became venial by his mercy. Likewise for venial sinne he nameth sinne not regnant, wherby he vnderstandeth inuoluntary motions of concupiscence. But for such inuoluntary motiõs (which Bel rightly calleth not regnant sinne, but wrongly venial) nether are they any true sinne as venial sinne is; nor is it any where reuealed, that they being of their nature mortal sins, are made venial only through Gods mercy. Therfore Bels beleefe of some sinnes made venial by Gods mercy is wholy besides Gods booke.

Bels beleefe of venial sinnes besydes Gods booke.

Fathers.

3. Holy Fathers also in calling some sinnes litle sinnes light, short, least, & daily offences: as S. Hierom in c. 5. Math. & l. 2. in Iouinian: S. Austin serm. 41. de sanctis. and in Enchir. c. 71. and S. Chrisostom. hom. 24. in Math. insinnuate that venial sinnes are such of their owne nature. for they were neuer litle, nor light, if of their nature they were mortal, and damnable: as a wounde, which of it nature is mortal, and deadly, could neuer be called a litle or light woũde, though God of his mercy did cure it: Likewise S. Hierom putteth a difference betweene *cacia*, and *hamartia*: and S. Gregory, and S. Austin betwixt *crimen* and *peccatum* yea S. Hierom epist. ad Celant. accounteth it a paradox of the Stoiks to put no difference betwixt *scelus*, and *erratum*.

S. Hierom. prope fin. S. Austin. to. 10. & 3. S. Chrysost. tom. 2. & Conc. 3. in Lazar. to. 2.

S. Hieron. dial. 2. cont. Pelag. S. Gregor. 21. moral. c. 9. S. Austin. hom. 19. de tempore.

4. By

4. By reason also this is euident. For who seeth not that to steale a pinne is of it nature a smal offence. And I would aske of Bel whither a sinne after it is by Gods mercy made venial, reteineth the selfe same nature of offending God, deseruing Hel, and the like, which it had before, or it changeth it nature? If it change it nature, then after Gods mercy, of it nature it is venial, and Gods mercy is only the cause of changing the nature of it. If it retaine the selfe same nature, how is it possible, but God if he account of it truly, according to truth (as al his iudgements are. Rom. 2. v. 2.) should not account of it as a mortal sinne, and deseruing hel. Wherfore what Protestants talke of some sinnes becomming venial, or no sinnes at al, by Gods meere not imputing them for sinnes, without any alteration in the sinnes them selfs, is meere contradiction, and contrary to S. Austin, and reason as is shewed in the fourth Article. c. 3. parag. 4. *Reason.*

5. Againe: infidels haue venial sinnes. Ergo venial sins become not such only by Gods meere not imputing them for mortal. The consequence is cleare out of the Protestants doctrine, who put that *not imputing* only towards the faithful & regenerate. The Antecedent I proue because they can doe al the sinnes Willet contrac. 17. part. 3. p. 560.

sinnes which the faithful doe. If one say that sinnes which in the faithful, be but venial are in Infidels mortal. This is contrary to reason, because knowledge of Gods precept in the faithful rather encreaseth his fault: *for the seruant which knoweth the will of his maister, and doth it not, shal be beaten with many stripes*, and ignorance in infidels diminisheth their fault: wherupon S. Paul said *I haue gotten mercy because I did it ignorātly in incredulity*. And I aske of Bel why God maketh sinne not regnant, venial, rather then regnant, and either he must say that God doth it without any cause, or because they are inuoluntary and these voluntary, which is to say, that by their different nature they are made mortal, and venial.

Luc. 12. 7. 48.

1. Timoth. 1. 7. 13.

6. Finally some sinnes of their nature breake frendship with God, and deserue his eternal hatred, and punishment. others do not. Ergo: some of their nature are mortal others venial. The consequence is euident: The Antecedent I proue: because he is no wise person, who wil fal out, and be offended for euer with his friend for euery trifle, as the taking vp of a straw: nor he is a iust Prince, who should inflict death for stealing a pinne: & I beleeue Bel would thinke him selfe vniustly hādled if he were so dealt withal. Wherfore if God should do this we should

should neither account him a wise friend, nor a iust Prince. Now let vs heare what Bel obiecteth against this so manifest truth.

7. Al his proofs may be reduced to this syllogisme, what is against Gods law is mortal sinne: al sinne is against Gods law: Ergo al sinne is mortal. Behould Bel here absolutly cõcludeth al sinne to be mortal, & after calleth our venial sinnes cursed, & deformed, which argueth that he thinketh al sinne to be indeed mortal notwithstanding Gods mercy. The Proposition he supposeth. The Assumption he proueth out of Scripture: Fathers, and Schoolmen. Out of Scripture becaus Christ said Math. 12. v. 5. that we shal giue account for euery idle worde: and S. Ihon 1. c. 3. v. 4. *telleth vs that Euery sinne is anomia that is, transgression of the law*: S. Ambrose also defineth sinne in general to be transgression of Gods law: And S. Austin describeth it to be *Euery worde, deed, or desire against Gods law*. Bellarmin affirmeth *euery sinne to be against Gods law*. Rhemists also confesse, *Euery sinne to be a swarving from the Law*: and doubtles (saith he) what swarueth from the law, is truly against the law. Likewise Angles, and Durand teach venial sinnes to be against the law. *Bel pag. 81. 82.* Bellarm. lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 21. Rhemist. 1. Io. 3. v. 4. Angles 4. sent. p. 213. Durand. 2. d. 42. q. 6.

8. To this argument Catholiques answer differently, some by denyal of the Proposi-

position, others by denial of the Assumption. Some say that euery sinne which is against the Law is not mortal, but only that which is perfectly against it, so that it destroieth the end of the law, which is Charity & this venial sinnes do not. And if I should answer thus, Bel were by and by at a Non plus. Others say that venial sinnes are not against the law, because they are not against the end of the law, but besides the law. But this difference is rather in words then in matter, al agreeing that venial sinne destroieth not Charity nor breaketh friendship with God, which is the end for which the law was made. Yet better it is to say, that venial sinnes are beside the law, then against the law: because what is not contrary to the end, but may stand with out breach of it, is not contrary to the meanes, but may stand without breach of them, but venial sinnes are not contrary to Charity the end of the law: but may be without breach of it. Ergo neither are they contrary to the law, but may be without breach of it. And as a man trauailing, though he steppe out of his way is not said to goe contrary to his iourneys end: so a man walking to heauē, though by venial sin he steppe out, or besides the way, yet doth he not goe the cōtrary way to hel: The Propesition of myne argument is euident:

1 Timoth. 1. v. 5.

Why venial sinnes are not against the law.

dent: for what can ſtand with the end, can not be contrary to the meanes neceſſary to that end. The Aſſumption both Catholicks graunt, and Hereticks can not deny if they admit that there are indeed any venial ſins. For venial ſins (whence ſoeuer they come to be ſuch) breake not friendſhip with God. And therfore if Bel graunt in deed (as he doth in words) that by Gods mercy ſome ſins are made venial, he muſt alſo confeſſe that by Gods mercy, they are not againſt his Charity, and friendſhip: and ſo muſt anſwer his owne argument, which indifferently proueth that there are no venial ſins at al, whither they be ſaid to be ſuch by their owne nature, or by Gods mercy: for the argument aſſumeth not that al which is ſinne of it owne nature is againſt Gods law, but abſolutly, al which is ſinne is againſt Gods law. And therfore if Bel thinke venial ſinne notwithſtanding Gods mercy to be true ſinne, he muſt as wel anſwer his owne argument as I.

Bels arguments as much againſt himſelf as againſt Catholiques.

9. Admitting therfore his Propoſition I deny his Aſſumption: and to his proofe out of S. Mathew. I anſwer that we muſt giue account for euery idle worde, not becauſe they be a againſt Gods law, but becauſe they be beſide it: And Bel wil beate his horſe not only when he turneth backe,

but

but also when he starteth out of the way. As for the text of S. Ihon, he telleth vs not (as Bel auoucheth) that euery sinne is *anomia* but absolutly Sinne is *anomia*, and may wel be vnderstoode of only mortal sinne which antonomastice is so called. This answere might suffice to what he bringeth about this text in this Article, yet because art. 4. he brought out of their due place many things about the greeke words *anomia* and *adicia* vsed by S. Ihon, which we remitted to this place, we wil here answer them at large, and afterward the rest of his proofs concerning this Article.

Chap. II.

A text of S. Ihon epist. 1. explicated.

Bel pag. 52.

1. Ioan. 3. v. 4.

S. Ihons words he citeth in Greeke *pas ho poion ten hamartian, kai ten anomian poiei, kai he hamartia estin he anomia* and translateth them thus. *Euery one that sinneth transgresseth the law, and sinne is the transgression of the law*, And hereupon inferreth that Euery sinne is transgression of the law, and consequently mortal. Catholiques answer twoe waies. First that S, Ihon in this place by sinne vnderstandeth only such sinne as c. 5. v. 16. he calleth *sinne to death* vz. mortal sinne,

sinne. And this I proue: Firſt becauſe in the next verſe but one vz. v. 6. he ſpeaketh only of mortal ſinne, when he ſaith. *Euery one that remaineth in him* (Chriſt) *ſinneth not*, and v. 8. *who doth ſinne is of the Diuel*, and v. 9. *Euery one that is borne of God committeth not ſinne, becauſe his ſeede remaineth in him.* In theſe verſes it is euident S. Ihon ſpake only of *ſome certeine kinde of ſinne which* (as S. Auſtin tract: 5. in 1. Iohn tom. 9. ſaith) *one borne of God can not cõmit*, vz. of mortal ſinne: wherfore of the ſame did he meane. v. 4. when he in ſome ſorte deſcribed ſinne by iniquity. Both becauſe els it ſhould ſeeme a kinde of equiuocation, as alſo becauſe if he had deſcribed ſinne in general, it is likely he would haue afterward diſcourſed of the ſame, and not of one only kind of ſinne. Secondly becauſe when a worde principally ſignifyeth one thing, it is not to be extended to an other, which ſecondarily it ſignifieth, vnles ſuch extention be gathered by ſome circumſtances of the ſpeech, ſeeing therfore the worde Sinne doth principally ſignify only mortal ſinne, and ſecondarily venial ſinne, according to S. Thomas. 1. 2. 4. 88. ar. 1. & there is no circumſtance here conuincing it to be extended to ſignify venial ſinne, but rather to the contrarie as hath bene ſhewed, it is not to be extended

S. Auſtin.

S. Thomas.

to venial ſinne. And this is confirmed becauſe Scriptures Fathers, and Catholicke writers by Sinne vnderſtād ordinarily only mortal ſinne, as appeareth by their attributing of death, loſſe of grace, and heauen, guilt of hel, ſeperation from God, and the like to Sinne, and by defyning it to be againſt Gods law, or trāſgreſſion of the law: which agree only to mortal ſinne.

S. Beda 1. Io. 3. 2. Thirdly becauſe S. Bede vnderſtandeth it of ſuch ſinne, as either is of contēpt of the written law, or corrupteth the innocency of the law of nature. And the gloſ. ord. followeth his very words: alſo gloſ. interlin. vnderſtandeth it of ſinne contrary to equity of Gods law: which he tooke of Lyra 1. Io. 3. S. Bede loc. cit. Lyra expreſſly expowndeth it of mortal ſinne, and defyneth it to be tranſgreſſion of the law. and the ſame doth Carthuſia: and to this purpoſe ſerue al Bels proofs, that *anomia* ſignifyeth tranſgreſſion of the law: for if that be ſo, then ſinne is taken for mortal ſinne. Nether againſt this expoſition ſee I any obiection, more then that the worde Sinne may ſignify venial ſinne, and that alſo it is taken for it c. 1. v. 8. where he ſaith *If we ſay we haue no ſinne we deceaue our ſelfs.* But we may anſwer that, though it may ſignify venial ſinne yet ordinarily it doth not, and therfore it is not wel infer-

inferred, that here it doth, especially seeing that there are diuers circumstances to the contrary. And though it signify sinne in general c. 1. v. 8 yet seeing it doth signify only mortal in this same chapter. v. 6. 8. and 9. better it is to gather the signification of a worde out of the next vse therof, then out of the further of. And if one wil thus expownd the place of S. Ihon (as to me it seemeth best) Bel were straight at a Non plus. For he suppoſeth that the worde sinne is taken for al kinde of sinne, and only proueth that the worde *anomia iniquity* is taken for perfect sinne, and transgression. yet because I wil giue him al the scoape he can aske, I admit that by Sinne S. Ihon vnderstood al kinde of actual sinne, and deny (as many Catholicks do) that *anomia Iniquity* is taken for wickednes, and perfect transgression of the law: but generally as it is common to perfect transgression, and only swaruing frō the law. Now let vs see how Bel improueth this.

S. Ihon meaneth onely of mortal sinne.

3. His first proofe is because Arias Montanus saith, that *anomia* is transgression of the law. But this is not against vs, because we graunt that it may signify so, only we deny that to be the proper signification of the worde, as is euident by the etimology therof, which is as much as *sine lege* without

pag. 52. Arias Montan. 1. 1o. 3.

the law, and not *contra legem*: againſt the law. yet becauſe al acts againſt law are alſo without law, the worde may be vſed for acts againſt law, and ſo ſignify tranſgreſſion of the law. It ſufficeth vs that the propriety of the worde is for vs not for Bel, and therfore we better expownd it of ſwaruing from the law, then Bel or any other doth of tranſgreſſion of the law.

Bel pag. 53. 4. His ſecond proofe is that S. Ambros
S. Ambroſ. de Parad. c. 8. and S. Auſtin l. 2. de conſen.
S. Auſtin. euang. c. 4. and l. 22. cont. Fauſt. c. 27. defyne ſinne to be preuarication, or tranſgreſſion of the law, or to be a thought, worde or deede againſt the eternal law, which (ſaith S. Auſtin) is deuine reaſon, or the wil of God commãding the order of nature to be kept, and forbidding it to be broken. But theſe, Fathers define only mortal ſinne; becauſe Catholicks ordinarily vnderſtand only that ſinne, when they abſolutly ſpeake of ſinne, as men, when they ſpeake of a thinge meane of ſubſtance. As alſo becauſe S. Ambros had before ſpoken only of mortal ſinne vz. of Adam, and Iudas his ſinne. And S. Auſtin in the firſt place ſpeaketh of ſinne againſt the tenne commandements, which no doubt is of it nature mortal, and in the ſecond place he plainly defineth ſuch ſinne, as breaketh the order of nature, which alſo

alſo is mortal ſinne not venial; for who wil ſay that a litle ſuperfluous laughter breaketh the ordet of nature. Beſides it followeth not that if S. Ambros, and S. Auſtin defined ſinne to be tranſgreſſion of the law, therfore S. Ihon did ſo cal it in this place.

5. His third proofe is out of S. Bede. But he is rather againſt him. For he ſaith that *anomia* ſignifieth *quaſi contra legem vel ſine lege factum*: as it were againſt law or without law. He ſaith not againſt, but as it were againſt, which more plainly he explicateth ſaying *Or without the law*. Lyra, and Carthuſia: whom he citeth ſeeme by *anomia*, and iniquity to vnderſtand wickednes, but then by ſinne they vnderſtand only mortal ſinne, and ſo fauour Bel nothing. But becauſe the Rhemiſts as preuenting an obiection write, that *The Worde* iniquity *is otherwiſe taken* 1. *Io.* 3. *v.* 4. *where ſinne is ſaid to be iniquity* then *c.* 5. *ver.* 17. *where iniquity is ſaid to be ſinne*, which they proue becauſe though the latine worde be al one, yet the greeke is differēt vz. *adicia* which ſignifyeth iniuſtice: Bel replyeth very wiſely forſooth out of S. Auſtins words trac. 4. in 1. Io. to. 9. *Let none ſay ſinne is one thing and iniquity an other; Euery one that ſinneth committeth iniquity.* As if the queſtion now betwixt the Rhemiſts, and him had bene, whither ſinne and iniquity were al one, and

S. Bed. 1. Io. 3.

Bel pag. 56.

Rhemiſt. 1. Io. 3.

S. Auguſtin. to. 9.

not whether *anomia*, and *adicia* be al one. Better therfore he replieth afterward pag, 58. where he proueth *anomia*. and *adicia* to be al one, becauſe the vulgar latine tranſlateth them both *Iniquitas*. But the Rhemiſts anſwere, That the worde *Iniquitas* is vſed in a different ſignification, and proue it by the different greeke words, for which it is vſed; And againſt this Bel ſaith nothing, But being at a non plus him ſelfe, and not able to reply againſt this anſwer, and reaſon, he cryeth out that *his anſwerer is at a non plus, & impudently denyeth euery iniquity? to be ſinne.*

6. But as for the Rhemiſts, euident it is that herein they are neither impudent, nor at a *Non plus*, ſeeing they giue a reaſon of what they ſay, againſt which Bel can not reply; And as for iniquity and ſinne, though they be oftentymes confounded both by Scriptures, & Fathers, yet if we wil ſpeake exactly and properly, more is required to formal, and proper ſinne, then to formal iniquity. For iniquity requireth only want of equity, and conformity to Gods law. formal ſinne beſides this requireth voluntarines, & ſo al formal ſinne is formal iniquity but not contrarywiſe. As adultery or murder committed by a foole or mad man is iniquity, but no more ſinne then it is in beaſts. Hereupon S. Auſtin l. 2. contr. Iulian. c. 5. diſtin-

Pſalm. 50. 118. & alibi ſup.

Difference betwixt formal ſinne and iniquity.

S. Auſtin.

distinguished two iniquityes, one which is sinne and blotted out in baptisme, an other which is the law of sinne & infirmity, & remaineth, & is yet iniquity: *because* (saith he) *iniquum est that the flesh should rebel against the spirit* & l. 6. c. 19. calleth lust against wil *some iniquity*, & yet oftentymes denyeth it to be true sinne. nether doth he say in the place which Bel citeth, that iniquity & sinne is al one, but that sinne is, not a different thing from iniquity, but that who cõmitteth sinne committeth iniquity, which how it is true is euident by that which is said. Albeit when he saith, that al iniquity is blotted out in baptisme, he confounde iniquity with sinne, as before is cited out of Scripture, which argueth that wel may the worde iniquity be taken in a different sense Iohn. 5. and 3. as Iohn 5. for voluntary iniquity, and proper sinne, as appeareth by the greeke worde *adicia*, and c. 3. for iniquity in general, as appeareth by the worde *anomia*, which is cõmon to volũtary, or inuolũtary.

7. The places of S. Ambros and S. Austin are already answered for they define only mortal sinne. And of the same vnderstandeth Bellarmin, when he saith al sinne is against the law: for venial sinnes he proueth not to be against the law: tom. 3. lib. 1. de amiss. grat. & stat. pecc. cap. 11. Nether

followeth it as Bel thinketh that some sinnes, are no sinnes, but only that Some sinnes are not perfectly sinnes, as Bellarmin proueth loc. cit. As for the Rhemists. doubtles it is false which Bel addeth, that what swarueth from the law is against it, as I haue proued against his bare assertion of the contrary. Durand and Angles I confesse did thincke venial sinnes to be against the law, but neither is this a matter of faith, neither do they intend to fauour Bel any thing, but answer his argument an otherway as hath bene shewed before.

Sup. c. 2. parag. 8.

8. But pretty it is to see, how that because Angles writeth, that *it seemeth now to be the commoner opinion in schooles, that venial sinnes are against the law*. Bel noteth the Romish religion of mutability, confessing that the olde Romane religion was Catholique, sownde, and pure, with which he wil not contend. Beholde the ytch which this fellow hath to calumniate the Romane religion. Angles insinuateth Schoole opinions to be mutable. Bel applieth it to Romane religion. as if it consisted of schoole opinions, which may be helde *pro & contra, salua fidei compage* with vnity in faith, as S. Austin speaketh. But seeing you haue graũted the olde Romane religion to haue bene Catholique and pure, & slaunder the late,

Bel pag. 82 Angles 2. sent. p. 275.

Olde Romã religiõ Catholique sound and pure.

S. Augustin. l. 1. cont. Iul. c. 6. to. 7.

I bring

I bring an action of ſlaunder againſt you, and charge you that you doe not like *doloſus, verſari in generalibus*, but to bringe good witneſſes, when, wherin, and by whome the late Romane religion corrupted the purity of the olde, knowing that otherwiſe (to vſe your phraſe) al the world wil cry with open mouth Fye vpon you, and your ſlaunderous Miniſtery. But in the meane tyme let vs proceed with him here.

9. *Their canoniẓed Martyr Bishop Fiſher* (ſaith he) *and Popiſh Biſhop Gerſon wrote, that venial ſinnes were ſuch only by the mercy of God.* Here Bel for one truth vttereth twoe vntruths. True it is that B. Fiſher and Gerſon were in that errour, but that was both before it was condemned in the Church, as it was ſince by Pius 5. and Gregorius 13. neither did they account inuoluntary motions of Concupiſcence for venial ſinnes, as Bel doth, but ſuch as Catholiques account venial. But vntrue it is that either B. Fiſher is canonized, or Gerſon was a biſhoppe who was only Chauncellor of the vniuerſity of Paris.

Bel pag. 83.

Ruffenſ. art. 32. cont. Luther.

Gerſon de vit. ſpirit. lect. 1. part. 1,

75. vntruth

76. vntruth

Trithem. in Gerſone.

10. Finally he concludeth this Article with this goodly reaſon. *one ſtealeth iuſt ſo many egges as are neceſſary to make a mortal ſinne, an other ſtealeth one les, but there can be no reaſon. Why God may iuſtly condemne the one to hel, and*

pag. 85.

A reaſon not worth a rotten egge.

not

not the other. therfore both ſinne mortally alike. To this I anſwer by demanding a reaſon, why the iudge may condemne him to death that ſtealeth thirteene pence halfe penny, and not him that ſtealeth one penny les. If he anſwer, becauſe the law condemneth one, and not the other. I aske againe, what reaſon was there, that the lawe was made againſt the one, and not againſt the other? And if Bel can finde a reaſon in this, he wil finde one in his owne queſtion. The reaſon of both is. becauſe ſuch a quantity is a notable iniury to our neighbour. and conſequently is againſt charity, & ſo breaketh the law, and a les quantity is not; *Be myndful therfore* (Bel) *from whence thou art fallen and do penance. Apocal. 2.*

Apocalip.

THE

THE SEVENTH ARTICLE OF VNVVRITTEN TRADITIONS.

Bel intituleth this seuenth article of traditions, though therein he handleth diuerse other matters, as of the sufficiencie and perspicuity of Scriptures, and of the readinge them in vulgar tongues, and by the common people, of the authoritie of Councels and oathes of Bishops. But these he handleth so confusedly & so tediously, being almost as longe in this one article as in al the rest, as I founde much more difficultie to gather togither, what he saied of euery point in different places, and to bringe them to some methodical order for the healpe of the readers memory, then I had to frame an answere. first therefore I wil entreate of Scriptures next of Tradition, then of Councels, and lastly of Bishops oathes.

CHAP. I.

The Catholique doctrine touching sufficiency of Scriptures propounded and proued, certayne vntruthes of Bel disproued.

ALBEIT euery one be forbidden to deny any point of the Christian faith, yet are not al cõmaunded to know actually euery

euery point thereof, but to some it sufficeth, that they beleeue the fundamental pointes conteyned in the Apostles Creede, and such like: and to be so disposed in minde, as they woulde beleeue the rest, if they knewe them: which is to be beleeue them implicitely or virtually. Moreouer one thinge may conteyne an other, either actually, as fyer doth conteyne heate, and the sunne light, or virtually, as a flynte conteyneth fyer and euery cause his effecte. These things supposed.

2. First Conclusion is. Al such pointes of Christian faith, as are necessarie to be actually beleeued of euery one, that hath vse of reason, though he be neuer so simple, are actually conteyned in Scripture, either clearely, or obscurely. This is nothing against traditions, because wel may they be, and are, pointes of Christian faith, though they be not such, as the actual and explicite beleefe of them be so necessarie, as none whatsoeuer can be saued without it. For it sufficeth that they be such as the implecite and virtual beleefe of them is necessary to euery ones saluation, and may be denyed of none vnder payne of damnation. And the conclusion is taught of Bellarmin lib. 4. *de Verbo non scripto, cap.* 11. Where expounding these wordes of S. Austine. *In these which*

3. Augustin. lib. de doct. Christian. c. 9. to. 3.

which are plainely set dovvne in scripture, are al those thinges founde, vvhich conteyne faith and maner of life: he answereth that S. Austine *speaketh of those pointes of doctrine which are necessary simply to al*, as they (saith he) are which are conteyned in the Apostles Creed and tenne cōmaundements. Likewise Stapleton affirmeth, that the Apostles wrote al, or almost al that parte of faith, which is necessary to be explicitely beleeued of al and euery one. And it seemeth euident, because such pointes of faith, as are precisely necessary to be actually knowen of euery one what so euer, be both fewe and are the fundamental, and most notorious pointes of Christianity, as the mysterie of the Trinity, the incarnation and passion of Christ, and such like, which are al actually (at least obscurely) conteined in scripture. For surely the prophets and Euangelists writinge their doctrine, for our better remembrance, would omitte no one point, which was necessary to be actually knowen of euery one, especially seeinge they haue writen many things with are not so necessary. And this cōclusion teacheth S. Austin when he saith, that *those thinges are written which seemed sufficient for the saluation of the faithful*. Where I note that he sayd not, *vvhich seemed sufficient to Christian faith*, but *which seemed sufficient to salua-*

Staplet. Relect. Contract. 5. q. 5. in explic. Artic.

S. Augustin. tract. 49. in Ioan. to. 9.

salvation, because fewer pointes suffice to saluation then the Christian faith conteineth, againe *In these* (things) *which are plainly sett downe in scripture, al those thinges are founde which conteine faith and maner of life.* Where I also obserue, that he saied not absolutely al things (as Bel translateth him) but al those things, insinuatinge, that he speaketh not of al things belonging to Christian faith, but onely of those which are necessary to be beleeued and done of euery one, which he calleth precepts of life, and rules of faith. And yet more plainely, *I beleeue also that herein there would be most cleere authority diuinorum eloquiorum of Gods Word, if man could not be ignorant of it, without losse of his promised saluation.* Where if by *diuina eloquia* we vnderstand holy writte (as Bel translateth pag. 95. and S. Augustin seemeth to meane, because immediatly before he spake of scriptures) me thinks he plainely auoucheth, that God hath procured euery thinge to be clearely written, which to knowe is necessary to euery mans saluation. The same teacheth S. Cyril saying. *Not al things vvhich our Lord did are vvritten, but vvhat the vvriters deemed sufficient, as vvel for manners as for doctrin, that by right faith, and vvorks vve may attayne to the kingdome of heauen.* And S. Chrisostome 2. Thess. hom. 3. *vvhat things soeuer are ne-*

L. 2. de doct. l. cit. sup.

Bel pag. 94. 110.

11. *False translation.*

S. Augustin. lib 2. de pec. mer. & remiss. cap. vlt. to. 7.

S. Cyril. lib. 11. in Ioan. cap. 68.

S. Chrysost.

are neceſſary are manifeſt out of Scripture.

3. Here by the way I muſt aduertiſe the Reader of Bels euil dealing with his maiſter Bellarmin and other Catholiques. For becauſe Bellarmin affirmeth. *That the Apoſtles wrote al things vvhich are neceſſary for al men, and vvhich they commonly vttered to al, but not al the reſt*, Bel inferreth: *That al things vvritten are neceſſary for al.* As if it were al one to ſay; Al things neceſſary for al are written, and al things written are neceſſary. Perhaps he thinks to turne propoſitions, as eaſely as he did his coate. And if al things written be neceſſary for al, as Bel gathereth, ſurely (as S. Hierom ſayd to the Pelagians teaching as Bel doth, that none can be without ſinne, but they that are skilful in the law) a great part of Chriſtendome muſt needs be damned, yea Luther and Caluin who profeſſe their ignorance in diuers points of Scripture. I omit that the vttering of ſome things to ſome fewe, who were perfect, ſpiritual, and fit to teach others, and capable of ſtrōg meate, as is manifeſt S. Paule did 1. cor. c. 2. v. 6. c. 3. v. 1. 2. Heb. 5. 14. 2. Timoth. 2. v. 2. Bel ſcornfully calleth *preaching in corners*, and ſuch hearers *Ieſuited Popelings*.

Bellarm. lib. 4. de verbo Dei c. 11.

Bel p. 114.

S. Hierom. dial. 1. cont. Pelagian.

Luther. præfat. in pſalm. Caluin. 3. inſtit. c. 2. parag. 4.

Bel p. 114.

4. And Catholicks he falſly chargeth with denying, that baptiſme of infants conſubſtantiality of God the Sonne with his

Bel p. 139. 141.

his Father, and the miſtery of the B. Trinity are in Scripture, or can be proued thence.

Bellarm. lib. 1. de baptiſ. c. 8. to. 2. For Bellarmin proueth baptiſme of Infants by as many arguments out of Scripture, as Bel doth vz. by three, out of the figure of circumciſion gen. 17. out of Chriſts words Ioan 3. and out of the practiſe of the Apoſtles act. 16. and 1. cor. 1. wherof Bel borrowed the firſt and laſt. The miſtery of the

Bellarm. lib. 2. de Chriſto c. 6. to. 1. Trinitie Bellarmin proueth by ſix arguments out of Scripture, and and the conſubſtantiality of Chriſt he proueth lib. 1. de chriſto. c. 4. out of eleuen places of the olde teſtament, to which he addeth c. 5. nyne more, and c. 6. fifteene places out of the new teſtament.

Luther. lib. cont. Iacob. Iaromum. Caluin. in Ioan. 10. See Staplet. Antidot. Euangel. in Io. 10. v. 30. 5. Better he might haue charged his good maiſters Luther and Caluin with this matter. For Luther ſaid, *his ſoule hated the vvorde omouſion*, or conſubſtantial, and Caluin expoundeth theſe places, which make moſt for the conſubſtantiality, as the olde Arrians did. Likewiſe Luther lib. cont. Cochleum an. 1523. ſaid *Infants are not at al to be baptiZed, if they do not beleeue.* And lib. de capt. Babil. c. de bapt. *Sacraments profit no body but*

Caluin. Io. 3. *faith alone.* And Caluin wil not haue the words Ioan 3. v. 5. (which made the very

Ex Auguſt. l. 3. de pecc. mer. & remiſſ. c. 30. Pelagians to graunt neceſſity of baptizing Infants) to be meant of baptiſme. Hereupon

upon the Anabaptists who deny baptisme of children, professe that they learnt their doctrine from Luther, and the new Arrians in Transiluania who deny the Trinity and consubstantiality of Christ in their disputation with Protestants, appealed to Calvins iudgement, & professed they receaued their doctrine from him. And Smidelin a great Protestant writeth. *That it is no maruel that very many Caluinists in Transiluany, Poleland, and Hungary became Arrians, and of Arrians soone after Mahometans.*

Balthasar Pacimontan. apud Cocleum in actis Lutheri.

See Posseuin de atheismis Hæreticorum.

Smidelin in refutat. blasphemiæ apolog. Danzi 1583.

6. But sport it is to heare Bel answer an obiection, which is the groūde of the Anabaptists. Infants haue no faith. Ergo theyare not to be baptized. First he saith they haue faith, & that their faith & profession is to be baptised of faithful parents in vnity of the Catholique Church. After he denyeth them to haue faith in act, but to haue faith fundamentally, and by inclination. How these answers agree let the Reader iudge. I would know of him. First whence he hath this new point of faith, that baptized infants haue to be borne of faithful parents. Are none borne of heretiks, or Infidels? Secondly. How they make profession of it by words or deeds, and whether Bel by their profession could discerne a baptised infant from one vnbaptized. Thirdly: how infants

Bel p. 140.

Inclination to faith iustifyeth Infants according to Bel.

can be iustified by faith alone, and haue no faith in act, but only an inclination therto. Surely they can haue iustification no otherwise then they haue faith, and therfore if they haue not faith in act, they can haue no iustification in act, but only be inclined to it, as they are inclined to faith.

Scripture containeth virtually al points of Christian faith.

See Staplet. Relect. controu. 5. q. 5. art. 1. S Austin l. 1. cont. Cresc. con. c. 31. Nullum mihi sacramentum aut fermo aliquis admodum obscurior de sacris literis aperitur vbi non eadem præcepta repetio. August. epist. 119. Propter duo præcepta charitatis sensisse Maist. quicquid in illis libris sensit nisi credidemus mendacem facimus Deum. August. 12. confess. c. 25. tom. 1.

7. Second conclusion. Al points of Christian faith are vertually conteyned in Scripture. First becaufe it teacheth vs to belieue the Church, which teacheth actually al points of Christian faith, and therfore Scripture vertually teacheth vs al. Hereupon wrote S. Auftin *That in doing what the Church teacheth, we holde the truth of Scriptures, albeit they afforde no example thereof, becaufe we therin follow the Church which the Scripture vndoubtedly sheweth*. Secondly becaufe the end of al Gods worde, whether written or vnwritten, is loue of him felfe aboue al things, and of our neighbour as our felfe, as appeareth by that 1. Timoth. 1. v. 5. *The end of the precept is charity*, and Rom. 13. v. 8. *who loueth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law*, and to the better comprehending and obtayning of this end, he referreth al whatfoeuer he reuealed, and this end being contayned in Scripture it followeth, that the Scripture doth vertually contayne (as a cauſe doth the effect) al points of faith.

8. And

8. And hereupon alſo it followeth that al the reſt of Gods worde whether written, or vnwritten may be called an explication of the foreſaid cómandements, becauſe it contayneth nothing, but which is vertually contayned in theſe commandements, & thereto referred by God, as to their end, which our Sauiour meant when he ſaid. *In theſe tvvo commandements, al the lavv and Prophets hange*, becauſe of them depend, as of their end, al the reſt, which the law and Prophets contayne. And hereupon ſaid S. Epiphan. hær. *65. That We may tel the inuention of euery queſtion, out of the conſequẽce of Scriptures.* He ſaid not out of ſcripture. For al can not be taken thence, as him ſelfe writeth hær. 61. but *of the conſequence of them*, becauſe al queſtions are reſolued out of the Scriptures, or out of that which followeth of them, as the effect of the cauſe. And according to theſe two concluſions, we may expound other Fathers, when they ſay al things are contained in Scripture. For either they meane not abſolutely of al points of Chriſtian faith, nor of actual containing (as appeareth by that other where they manifeſtely defend Traditions) but either only of points neceſſary to be knowne of euery Chriſtian, or of vertual containing. *Matth. 22. 7. 40.* *S. Epiphan.*

5. Third concluſion: Al points of Chriſtian

All points of Christian faith are not actually in the Scripture.

stian faith are not actually cõtained in scripture, neither clearly nor obscurely, neither in plaine words, nor in meaning. This concluſiõ Bel seemeth to graunt, pag. 118. where he admitteth of a thing although not expresly written, yet *vertually* (saith he) *and effectually contained in Scripture.* And the whole English Cleargy defyne. *That what may be proued out of Scripture is necessary to be beleeued, though it be not read.* But what can be proued, what not, they alone wil be iudges. But whatsoeuer Protestants say. I proue the conclusion. For no where in Scripture it is sayd, either in plaine words or in meaning. That al the books, chapters, verses, and sentences, which in the Bible are admitted for Canonical, are truly Canonical, and Gods pure worde, without the mixture of mans worde. If Bel can finde any such place from the first of Genesis to the last of the Apocal: let him name it. And yet this is a point of Christian faith, yea thereupon depende al the Articles we gather out of Scripture. For as S. Austin said epist. 9. and 19. *If any vntruth be founde in Scriptures what authority can they haue?* So if any part or parcel of the Bible be doubtful, what certainty can the rest haue? Secondly the perpetual virginity of our B. Lady is a matter of faith, as appeareth by S. Hierom, and S. Austin, who

Article 6.

1.

S. Austin. 2.

S. Hierom. con. Heluid. S. Augustin. hæres. 84. 82. S. Epiphan. Aær. 78. S. Hilar. in 2. Math. Can. 1.

who accounted Heluidius, and Iouinian heretiks for denying it, and Proteſtants confeſſe it. And yet it is no where teſtifyed in Scripture. Thirdly that the ſeauenth day cõmanded by God to be kepte holy, is tranſferred lawfully from Saterday to Sunday is a matter of faith, and yet no where actually warranted by Scripture. For albeit S. Ihon Apoc. 1. 10. ſpeake of our lords day, yet he no where warranteth the ſaid transferring. See more in Bellarmin. tom. 1. lib. 4. de *Verbo Dei.*

VVillet Tetract. 2. piller. part. 3. p. 76. 77. 3.

10. Fourth Concluſion: Al points of Chriſtian faith can not be ſufficiently, and immediatly proued out of Scripture. In this concluſion I ſay not. That no points of Chriſtian faith, nor that al can not by ſome way or other be proued, by ſome ſimilitude, congruity, or probable illation; nor that immediatly by teſtimony of the Church whoſe teſtimony in al doctrine of faith can be immediatly proued out of Scripture. But only deny, that al can be immediatly proued out of ſcripture by the very words of Scripture, and ſo ſufficiently as it ſufficeth to captiuate our vnderſtanding into obedience of faith. This is directly againſt the ſixt Article of Proteſtants faith, and againſt Bel in this whole Article: But I prooue it as I did the former

Al points of Chriſtian faith can not be proued ſufficiently and immediatly out of Scripture.

Articles 39 decreed by Bishops and Ministers 1562. and 1571.

conclusion. For there is no place of al the Scripture, which sufficiently proueth al the rest to be Canonical, our B. Lady to be a perpetual virgin, and the Sabbath to be lawfully translated from Saterday to Sunday. And it shal be more euident out of that, which we shal say of Traditions, and in answer to Bels arguments. For the present it sufficeth, that it is so cleare, as our very aduersaries do somtime confesse it. As Bel pag. 134. and 135. art. 7. admitteth one point of faith, which is not in the Bible, & professeth that they meane not of it, when they say al things necessary to saluation are contained in Scriptures. And Luther art. 37. said *That purgatory can not be proued out of Scripture*, and yet in the assertion of the same he said. *That he was certaine there was Purgatory*, nor *cared much what Hereticks babled to the contrary*. Now let vs come to Bels obiections, which albeit for the most part be against Traditions, yet becausse the matters of sufficiency of Scripture, and of Traditions are connexed, and becausse we wil keepe his order, as much as we can, we wil here answer them in that order; as they are propounded by him.

All thinges can not be taken out of Scripture. Epiphan. hæs. 61.

See Couel art. 4. p. 31. & *Hooper with him.* *Bel p.* 134. 135.

Luther. See Roffens. con. Luther. verit. 4. & Bellarm. lib. 4. de verb. Dei c. 4. col. 364.

Luther certaine of Purgatory.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Bels arguments out of the oulde Teſtament concerning the ſufficiency of Scripture anſwvered.

Bel citeth dyuers places which make nothing for abſolute ſufficiency of Scriptures, or againſt Traditions, but only bid vs obey, and follow the law, as Ioſue 1. v. 7. and 23. v. 6. & Malach. 4. v. 4. omitting therfore theſe places I anſwer to other as Deuter. 4. v. 2. and Prouerb. 30. v. 6. where God forbiddeth vs *to adde to his worde*, and Deuter. 12. v. 32. where we are bidden to *doe to the lorde onely that which he commandeth without adding, or taking away* First that theſe places make as much againſt Proteſtants as Catholicks. For they admit one vnwritten Tradition, as Bel confeſſeth and appeareth by Brentius, Kempnitius, & the Deane of the chappel, and the places cyted by Bel forbid as wel the adding of one thing, as of many to Gods worde. *Bel pag. 86. 87. 88. 89.* *Bel p. 134. 135.* *Brent. in prolegom. Kemnit. in examin. Conc. Trid.*

2. Secondly. I anſwer that they make nothing againſt theſe Traditions, which Bel impugneth vz. ſuch as are neceſſary, to mans ſaluation for ſuch are indeed Gods worde though vnwritten. For the two firſt places only forbid adding to Gods worde *Bel pag. 86. in præfat. Articuli.*

any thing of our owne head, or which is mans worde as may be proued. First by the reason of the forbiddance prouerb. 30. cit. v2. *least we be disproued, and fownde lyers*: as no doubt we might, by adding mans worde which is subiect to lye, but not by adding Gods Worde, which can neuer proue vntrue, though it be not written. Secondly, because the Iewes did euer adde one thing to Gods written worde, as Bel confesseth pag. 134. and the Deane of the chappel affirmed *they added both signes, and words vnto the institution of the Passouer prescribed vnto them by Moyses: which addition and tradition of theirs* (saith he) *was approued by our Sauiour at his last supper.* And this doctrine was exceeding wel liked in the conference at Hampton Court. Thirdly because the Prophets, and Euangelists, did adde to Moyses law without breaking of the commãdement in the aforesaid places.

Conference at Hampton Court. p. 68.

Iewes added signes and words to Gods word and their addition confirmed by Christ.

Bel pag. 89. 3. Bel answereth. *That the doctrine of the Prophets, is nothing els but an explication of the law.* But if by the worde *explication*, he vnderstand only such as adde nothing to the sense, or meaning of the law, but only explicate in other words, types or figures, the bare meaning of the law, he speaketh most absurdly. For beside that it is spoken without any reason at al, it is against reason, and sense,

ſenſe, to ſay that al the books of Ioſue, Iudges, Kings, and Prophets adde no ſenſe to the law of Moyſes. For where doth the law of Moyſes tel vs of euery worde, or action of euery particuler man, or woeman recorded in the books of the oulde Teſtament, written ſince the law was giuen? Where is euery worde or deede of euery perticuler perſon in the new Teſtament? And although dyuers actions of Chriſt eſpecially his death, and paſſion was prefigured in the law, yet the like can not be thought of euery action, or ſpeech of euery perticuler perſon, ſo that the words or figures of Moyſes law, actually tolde whatſoeuer perticuler things ether Prophets, or Euangeliſts euer wrote. Wherfore S. Auſtin lib. 1. retract. c. 22. recalled what he had ſaid lib. cont. Adimant. c. 3. *That al the precepts, and promiſes in the new Teſtament, are in the oulde. For certaine precepts there be* (ſaith he) *not figured, but proper, which are not found in the oulde Teſtament, but in the new.* And for this cauſe. Tertullian lib. cont. Hermog. called the Ghoſpel a *ſupply of the oulde Teſtament.*

S. Auſtin.

Tertullian.

4. But if Bel by the word (explication) comprehend al ſuch additions, as though they adde to the ſenſe and meaning of the law, yet are ether of their nature, or of the inten-

How traditions are explicatiõ of the lavv.

intention of the adder referred to the better, vnderſtanding, comprehenſion, and fulfilling of the law, as al the reaſons, ſimilitudes, compariſons, examples, and ſentences in an oration, are explications of the theame therof, becauſe though they adde ſenſe to the ſenſe of the theam, yet they al tend to the perfect comprehenſion of the theame, I graunt al the writings of Prophets, and Apoſtles to be explications of the law, as hath bene explicated in the ſecond concluſion, but withal adde, that the Traditions of the Church are ſuch like explications. For what they containe, is in like ſort referred (as a meane to the end) to the perfect vnderſtanding, and fulfilling of the ſaid law, and ſo they are no other additions to Moyſes law, nor no otherwiſe prohibited therby then the reſt of Scripture is.

Chapt. 1. pag. 7. & 8.

5. What hath bene ſaid to the place of Deut. 4. may be applyed to the other place Deut. 12. if it be vnderſtood of the moral law, which God gaue to the Iewes. But rather I thinke it is to be vnderſtood of the Ceremonial law. Both becauſe it is not ſaid abſolutly what I command that only do, as it would, if it had bene meant of the Moral law: but *That only doe thou to the lord*, which words (*to the lorde*) inſinuate the meaning to be only of the Ceremonial law, & manner of

ner of sacrifice to be done to God. As also immediatly before, God had forbidden the Iewes in their manner of worshipping him to imitate the ceremonyes of Gentils in worshipping their Gods, because they had many abhominable vses, as of sacrifizing their children, and streight after concludeth *What I command, thee that only do thou to the lorde, nether adde any thing, nor deminish.* Wherby we see that the worde (*Command*) he extended only to sacrifices, and ceremonyes, which before he had prescribed to be done to him selfe, and would haue therin no alteration at al.

6. Nether hindereth this that which Reinolds obiecteth. *That mention here is made of sacrificing children, which is forbidden by the moral law.* For mention is made therof, not as of a thing forbidden there, but as of a reason of forbidding the Iewes, in worshipping God to imitate Gentils, because (saith God) *they sacrifice children,* And of this Ceremonial law very likely it is, that God absolutly would haue no addition, or alteration at al to be made, vntil it were quite abrogated by Christ. And the like reason is not of Gods law concerning faith, and manners. For there being no such difference in the Ceremonies of the law, but what some Iewes obserued al might alike, expedient it was

Reinolds a. pol. thes. p. 207.

Ceremonial law perfectly prescribed to the Iewes and why.

was that al the Ceremonies should be prescribed at once, to the end al might worship God after the same manner, especially seeing the Iewes were as S. Paul writeth. Gal. 4. v. 1. 2. 3. *litle ones nothing differing from seruants vnder tutours, and gouernours, and seruing vnder elements of the vvorlde.* And therfore had al the rudiments, and ceremonies of religion most exactly prescribed vnto them by God, with commandement to abstayne from any alteration.

S. Paul.

vvhy the lavv touching faith and manners not prescribed al at once.

7. But seeing in matters of faith, and precepts of manners there is great difference, because euen the same men are not capable at once of vnderstãding al misteries, as appeareth by our Sauiours words to his Apostles. Ihon 16. v. 12. *I haue many things to say vnto you, but you can not carry* (them) *novv.* And much lesse are al men a like capable of the same misteryes. And in like manner al men were not a like capable of the same precepts of life. And therfore as S. Austin saith: *God gaue by Prophets the lesse precepts to that people, vvhich vvas yet to be tyed vvith feare, and greater precepts by his sonne to a people, vvhome he had agreed to free vvith loue.* Therfore it was not expedient, that God should at once prescribe vnto men al that they were to beleeue, or doe: but at such tymes, as seemed fit to his dyuine wisdome to adde therunto by his

S. Augustin. de sermon. Domini in monte.

by his Prophets, and Euangelists.

8. Moreouer Bel alleadgeth Esay. 8. v. 20. *Ad legem magis & ad testimonium. Quod si non dixerint iuxta verbum hoc non erit eis matutina lux. Rather to the law, and to the testimony. If they speake not according to this worde ther shal not be morning light to them.* This place helpeth him nothing. First becauſe the Prophet nameth not only the law, but testimony alſo, which comprehendeth Gods vnwritten worde: as appeareth: Ioan. 3. v. 11. Rom. 8, v. 16. Hebr. 11. v. 39. Act. 4. v, 33. 1. Ioan. 5. v. 33 and other where and therfore maketh more for vs then againſt vs. Secondly becauſe Esay doth not abſolutly bid vs recurre to the law, & testimony, but magis, rather to them then to witches, of whom he had immediatly forbidden vs to enquire. Wherfore Bel in not englishing the worde *magis* as he did the reſt, corrupted of ſet purpoſe the Scripture, to make it ſeeme *magis* more for his purpoſe Thirdly though by the law, and testimony we vnderſtood only Gods writtē worde, the place maketh nothing againſt vs. For then Esay indeed should bid vs goe to Gods written worde, which we refuſe not to doe in al doubts, wherin it reſolueth vs, but forbiddeth vs not to goe to any other, which is as he ſaith *iuxta verbum hoc*, agreable to this worde

Bel pag. 88.

Ioan. 1. 7. 8. 15. 18. 1. Timoth. 6. Apoc. 12.

Corrupt. of Scripture.

worde. yea God him ſelfe commanded vs
Deuter. Deutr. 32. v. 7. *to aske our Fathers, and elders,*
Iob. and Iob. 8, v. 8. to *aske the ancient generation, & ſeeke out the memory of the Fathers.* Wherfore ether muſt Bel proue, that the Churches Traditions are not *iuxta verbum hoc* agreable to Gods written worde (which he shal neuer doe:) or he muſt know, that God not only forbiddeth vs, but rather commandeth vs to ſeeke after, and follow them.

Bel pag. 89. 9. S. Hierome alleadged by Bel only
S. Hierom. in c. 8. Eſaiæ. ſaith abſolutly. *That doubts may be reſolued out of Scripture, and who wil not ſeeke Gods worde shal abide in errour*, which is vndoubted truth, but nothing againſt vs. But affirmeth not. That al doubts may be determined out of Scripture, and that we ought to ſeeke nothing els whatſoeuer. Yea him ſelfe epiſt. ad Marcel. reſolueth lent to be keapt only
S. Hierom. by Apoſtolical tradition: And l. cont. Heluid. bringeth not one place of Scripture to proue our B. Ladyes perpetual virginity againſt that hereticke, though he bring many to shew that the places, which the hereticke alledged conuince not the contrary. And thus much touching Bels places out of the oulde Teſtament.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Bels arguments out of the newu Testament touching sufficiency of Scripture answvered.

HIS first place out of the new Testament is Ioan. 20. v. 30. *These are written that you may beleeue, that Iesus is Christ the sonne of God. & that in beleeuing, you might haue life through his name.* And biddeth vs obserue *that S. Ihons Ghospel was written after al other Scriptures, euen when the Canon of Scripture was complest, perfect, and fully accomplished: VZ. about the 14 yeare of Domitian almost an 100. yeare after Christs ascension:* and thereby thinketh to auoyde al our sottish cauils (as he tearmeth them.) Meaning forsooth that S. Ihon meant these words: (*These are vvritten*) of the whole Canon of the Scripture. *Bel pag. 90.*

2. Omitting Bels manifest error, where he maketh the 14. yeare of Domitian to be about 100. years after Christs ascension, which was but about the 97. yeare after Christs nativity, as is euident by al Chronicles, or supputators of tymes, and so wanted almost 40. of an 100. after his ascension. Omitting also an other manifest error, in affirming S. Ihon to haue written his Ghospel almost an 100. years after Christs ascen- *Two grosse errors in Chronographie.* Baron. An. 97. Onuphrius chron. 96. Euseb. chronic. 97.

sion

See Baron. An. 101. Eusebius in chron. S. Hieron in Scriptur. Eccleſiaſt. in Ioanne & in chron.

ſion, who dyed the 68. yeare after his paſſion, as Euſebius and S. Hierom teſtify, and therfore could not write almoſt an 110. years after Chriſts aſcenſion, vnles he wrote many years after his owne death.

3. But omitting theſe errors, as teſtimonies of Bels ignorance in hiſtories, which I regard not. To his argument I anſwer. That thoſe words (*Theſe are written*) are meant only of (*ſigna*) miracles done by Chriſt, and written by S. Ihon, to moue vs to beleeue that Chriſt was God. Reinold. theſ. 1. pag. 60. confeſſeth. *That they are referred properly to* (*ſigna*) *myracles*, yet wil haue them alſo meant of precepts, & doctrine written by S. Ihon, becauſe *myracles are to confirme, and perſvvade doctrine and precepts.* But I proue that they are meant only of miracles. Becauſe S. Ihon hauing recorded diuers miracles of Chriſt, afterward (immediatly before thoſe ſayd words) ſaith, *Many other miracles did Ieſus in the ſight of his diſciples, vvhich are not vvritten in this booke.* And then addeth. but *Theſe are written that you may beeleue that Ieſus is Chriſt the ſonne of God. &c.* Who ſeeth not here, that the demonſtratiue pronowne (*Theſe*) is referred only to miracles. For S. Ihon hauing ſaid that many miracles were vnwritten, ſtreight after with the aduerſatiue, or exceptiue particle (*But*) which

See S. Cyril. l. 12. in Ioan. c. 61.

Reinolds.

v. 30.

v. 31.

Bel.

Bel guilefully leaft out) excepteth theſe which he had written from the condition of others, which he had not written ſaying *But theſe are written: &c?* And Reinolds reaſon is ſo far from proving his purpoſe, as it proueth the quite contrary. For becauſe Christs doctrine, and faith was the end of S Ihons writing, and myracles the meanes, and motiues to bring men to Christs faith, as him ſelfe profeſſeth in the forſaid words, euidēt it is that he meaneth both of Christs doctrine, and miracles, in the foreſaid verſe, but differently, and vnder different words. For of myracles he meaneth as motiues, and meanes, vnder the words. (*Theſe are written &c.*) And of doctrine he meaneth as the end of his writing the myracles, vnder the other words (*That you may beleeue*; &c.)

Reinolds proof against himſelf.

4. But ſuppoſe that S. Ihon by (*Theſe*) vnderſtood both myracles, & doctrine, can Bel therfore infer that S. Ihon meant of the whole canon of Scriptures? Surely no: becauſe he hauing before ſaid. That many other myracles of Christ were not written in this booke, and immediatly adding. *But theſe are written*: &c. can not be vnderſtood but of his owne writing, and in his owne. Ghoſpel. wheruppon if Bel inferre any thing, he muſt inferre that S Ihons Ghoſpel alone is abſolutly ſufficient, and conteineth

conteineth al things neceſſary. Which I hope he wil not doe. Reinolds graunteth that S. Ihons Ghoſpel is ſufficient, ſuppoſing that we heare of no other. But this is nothing to the purpoſe. For they out of this place inferre the Scripture to be abſolutly ſufficiēt, ſo as we may reiect al other things though we heare of them: And therfore ſeeing S. Ihon in this place can not be vnderſtood, but of his owne Ghoſpel, if hence they proue abſolute ſufficiency of Scripture againſt Traditions, they muſt inferre abſolute ſufficiency of S. Ihons Ghoſpel againſt al other what ſoeuer: I omit a place Bel alleadgeth out of S. Cyril, with an other out of S. Auſtin, which I cited in the firſt concluſion. For they proue no more then is there affirmed.

Io. Reinolds apol. p. 116.

S. Cyril. lib. 12 in Io. cap. vlt.

S. Auguſtin. tract. 49. in Ioan.

Sup. c. 2. paſſag. 2.

Bel pag. 91.

5. His ſecond place out of the new teſtament is act. 20. v. 27. *I haue not ſpared to ſhew vnto you the whole counſel of God.* Therfore (ſaith he) the whole counſel of God touching our ſaluation, is conteined in holy Scripture. Omitting his needles proofs out of Lira, and Carthu: that S. Paul meaneth of al counſel touching our ſaluation. I anſwer that this place ether maketh directly againſt Proteſtants, or not at al againſt Catholiques. For ſeeing S. Paul ſpeaketh of his owne shewing vnto the Epheſians, if he be vnder-

vnderſtood of ſhewing only by writing, it followeth, that his epiſtle to the Epheſians conteineth al Gods counſel, and is abſolutly ſufficient, which is againſt Proteſtants. But if he be vnderſtood (as he ſhould be) of ſhewing in general, ether by worde, or writing, nothing followeth to Bels purpoſe or againſt Catholiques.

6. But (ſaith Bel) *it wil not ſuffice to anſwer That al Gods counſel was preached, but not written, becauſe S. Paul was an Apoſtle of that Ghoſpel, which was promiſed by the Prophets, & taught no other thing, then that the Prophets had foretolde.* But this proueth no more of S. Paul, then of al the Apoſtles. For they were al Apoſtles of the ſame Goſpel, and taught the ſame doctrine, which he did, and yet ſome of them wrote neuer a worde. Some ſhew it hath to proue, that al which S. Paul preached was written by the Prophets which how it is to be vnderſtood hath bene before explicated. pag. 91. Rom. 1. Act. 26. Sup. c. 1. parag. 7. & 8.

7. And becauſe Bellarmin ſaith. *That the Scripture is an infallible and moſt ſecure rule of faith.* And *That he is mad who reiecting Scripture followeth inward inſpirations.* Bel chargeth him *to contradict him ſelfe teaching els vvhere the contrary*, but cyteth no place, becauſe none is to be found) and *to confound him ſelfe becauſe he wil not rely vpon Gods vvritten teſt-* Bellarm. lib. 1. de Verbo Dei. cap. 1. & 2. Bel pag. 93. vntruth 77 vntruth 78

ten testimonies, but seeke after vnwritten vanities, and ground his faith vpon them. Here Bel slandereth Bellarmin. For when did euer he or any Catholique refuse to rely vpon Gods written testimony? when did they not account it a most infallible rule of faith? vpon what vanities do they ground their faith? we confesse Scripture to be an infallible rule but not the total rule, but as Bellarmin saith lib. 4. de verb. dei c. 12 *the partial rule.* Let Bel improue this *Hic Rhodus, hic Saltus.*

Bellarmin.

Bel pag. 93. S. Augustin. cont. Adimant. cap. 3. co. 6.

S. Augustin. lib. 1. Retrac. c. 22. co. 1.

S. Paul.

8. Moreouer he alleadgeth S. Austin writing. *That there are no precepts, or promises in the doctrine of the Ghospel, and Apostles, which are not in the old Testament.* True. But as S. Austin afterward in expresse words recalled, and corrected this error: so I would wish Bel to do: His third place is 2. Timoth 3 v. 15. *Holy scriptures are able to make thee wise to saluation.* This maketh not against vs. both becauſe we deny not that Scripturs are able to make men wiſe to saluation: but only deny that they alone do it. As also becauſe we graunt, they actually conteine whatsoeuer is necessary to euery mans saluation, and vertually whatsoeuer els. And lastly becauſe the forsaid words are meant only of the old Testament, which S Timothy (saith S. Paul there) *Had learned from his infancy,* which

How Scriptures are able to make men wise to saluation.

1.

2.

which alone being not (as Proteſtants confeſſe) abſolutly ſufficient, ſo as we may reiect the new teſtament, they can not therof inferre Scripture to be ſo abſolutly ſufficient, as that we may reiect Traditions. Now let vs come to his proofs out of Fathers, which particulerly proceed againſt Traditions.

Chap. IIII.

Bels arguments out of Fathers touching ſuffiſiency of Scripture, and Traditions anſwvered.

VIncentius lyrin: who lyued in S. Auſtins tyme writeth. *That he enquiring of many holy and learned men. How he ſhould eſcape hereſy: they al anſwered him by ſticking to Scripture and the Churches Traditions.* And. S. Ireney writeth of him ſelfe, that *by traditions of the Church of Rome, he confounded al thoſe that teach otherwiſe then they ſhould.* No maruel therfore if Bel being deſyrous not to eſcape, but to ſpread hereſy, and loth to be confownded, do with the olde hereticks Marcionits, and Valentinians: ex Iren: l. 3. c. 2. and Tertul. de præſcrip with the Arians ex Hilario l. cont. Conſtant. Auguſt. l. 1. contr. Maximin. with the Aerians ex Epipha. her. 75. with the Ennomians ex Baſil.

Vincent. Lyrin. con. hæreſes.

S. Ireney lib. 3. c. 3.

Ould heretiks deteſt traditions, S. Iren. Tertullian. S. Hilarie. S. Auguſtin. c. 1 to. 6. S. Epiphan.

S. Basil. 7. Synod. Basil. l. de spir. sanct. c. 27. 29 with the Nestorians, and Eutichians ex. 7. Synod. act. 1. impugne Traditions. And let not the Reader maruel that Bel bringeth the words of dyuers Fathers against Traditions, which almost al are obiections taken out of Bellarmin. For they make no more for his purpose, then the words of Scripture did for the Diuel. or Iewes, when they alleadged them against Christ. And we wil bring such expresse words of the same Fathers for Traditions, as shal cleare al suspition, and can admit no solution.

Bellarm. lib. 4. de verbo Dei c. 11.

Math. 4. v. 6. Ioan. 12. v. 34.

Bel pag. 94. S. Dionys. de diu. nom. c. 1. 2. First he cyteth Dionis. Areopag. saing *we must neither speake nor thinke any thing of the Deity (præter ea) beside those things, which Scriptures haue reuealed.* I might except, that Protestants deny Dionis. Areopag. to be author of those bookes, but I neede not. For the words make nothing to the purpose; both because they forbid only speaking or thincking of the Deity beside that which Scripture reuealeth: as also because by (*præter*) he vnderstãdeth not euery thing out of Scripture, els we should not vse the words Trinity, and Consubstantiality but only such as are quite beside, and neither actually nor vertually are conteined in Scripture. But let S. Dionis. tel plainly his owne minde concerning Traditions, *Those first Captai-*

Centur. Cēt. 1. lib. 1 c. 10. Luther. & Caluin. ex Bellarm. l. 2. de Monachis c. 5.

nes

pes (saith he) *and Princes of our Hierarchy haue deliuered vnto vs diuyne, and immaterial matters partly by Written, partly by their vnvvritten institutions.* How could Apostolical Traditions be more plainly auouched. S. Dionys. l. de ecclesiastic. Hierarch. c. 1.

3. Two places Bel bringeth out of S. Austin, which because we alleadged them in cap. 1. conclus. 2. and proue no more then is there taught I omit. And as for S. Austin, he not only auoucheth Apostolical Traditions, epist. 118. but de Genes. ad litt. l. 10. c. 23. tom. 3. professeth, that *baptisme of infants were not to be beleeued, if it were not an Apostolical tradition*, and obiecteth them against the Pelagians in lib. cont. Iulian. amoni, and giueth vs this rule to knowe them. *If the whole Church obserue them and no Councel appointed them*: l. 2. de bapt. c. 7. 6. 23 24 S. Ireney he cyteth, because he writeth *That the Ghospel which the Apostles preached, they aftervvard deliuered vnto vs in Scriptures, and it is the foundation of our faith.* These words proue no more then that the Apostles preached not one Ghospel, & writ an other, but one and the selfe same. But that euery one of them, or any one of them writ euery whit they al preached S. Ireney affirmeth not. And his affection to Traditions is euident, both out of his words before rehearsed, as also lib. 3. c. 4. where he saith *We ought to* S. Augustin. 2. de doct. Christian. c. 6. & 2. de peccat mer. & remiss. c. vlt. S. Austins rule to knovv Apostolical traditions. S. Ireney lib. 3. c. 1. S. Ireney.

keepe Traditions, though the Apostles had written nothing. And affirmeth *many barbarous nations of his tyme, to haue beleeued in Christ, keapt the doctrine of ſaluation, and antient Tradition without Scripture.*

Vel pag. 95. Tertul. con. Hermogen.

4. The next he produceth is Tertullian writing thus, *I reuerence the fulnes of Scripture, which sheweth to me the Maker, and the things made.* And ſoone after. *But whither al things were made of ſubiacent matter. I haue no where readde, let Hermogenes hoppe shew it written. If it be not written, let him feare that wee prouided for them, that adde or take away.* Answer. Tertullian ſpeaketh of one perticuler matter, which the hereticke Hermogenes of his owne head, not only without Tradition, or Scripture, both contrary to both, taught of creating the worlde of ſubiacent matter, & not of nothing And no maruel if Tertullian ſaid the Scripture was ful in this poynt, and required Scripture of Hermogenes, for proofe of his hereſy; being ſure he could alleadge no Tradition. But for true Traditions, Tertullian is ſo great a manteiner of them, as lib. de preſcrip. he thincketh hereticks ought to be confuted rather by them, then by Scripture, and other where affirmeth diuers things to *be practiſed in the Church as the ceremonies in baptiſme, ſigne of the Croſſe, and ſuch like, only by authority of Tradition without al*

Tertull. lib. de Corona milit. lib. 1. cont. Marcionem l. 2. ad vxorem.

without al proofe of Scripture. vvhere of (saith he) *Tradition is the beginner, custome conseruer, and faith the obseruer.*

5. Of S. Cyprian Bel much triumpheth, becauſe writing againſt one particuler Tradition, of not rebaptizing the baptized by hereticks, which he thought had bene a meere humane and miſtaken tradition, he ſaith. *Cometh it from our Lord, or the Goſpels authority? Cometh it from the Apoſtles precepts, or epiſtles? For God witneſſeth that the things are to be done, which are written, and propoſeth to Ieſus Name ſaying. Let not the booke of this law depart from thy mouth, but thou ſhalt meditate therin day, and night, that thou mayſt obſerue to doe al things that are written in it. If therfore it be commanded in the Ghoſpel, or contayned in epiſtles of Apoſtles, or acts, that who came from any hereſy be not baptized, but hands impoſed vpon them for pennance, let this diuine, and holy Tradition be kept.* *Bel pag. 56.*

Primo imitare pietatem humilitatemque Cipriani & tunc profer conſilium Cipriani. Auguſt. lib. 2. cont. Creſcon. cap. 31. to. 7. S. Cyprian. epiſt. ad Pompeium.

6. Theſe words at the firſt view ſeeme to make for Bel, but if the cauſe and circumſtances of S. Cyprians writing be conſidered, they make rather againſt him. S. Cyprian neuer reiected al Traditions (yea by it l. 2. epiſt. 3. he proued water to be mingled with wyne in the ſacrifice, and in the epiſtle cited by Bel, biddeth vs recurre to Apoſtolical Tradition) but only the foreſaid

S. Cyprian.

said Tradition, becauſe he thought as he ſaith epiſt. ad Iubaian. that it *Was neuer before commanded or written*, but (as he writeth epiſt, ad Quint:) *miſtaken for an other Tradition of not rebaptizing ſuch as fal into hereſy.* Wherfore Bel pag. 118. moſt falſly affirmeth *that he sharply reproued P. Steeuen for leaning to Tradition.* For he reproued him only for leaning to a miſtaken (as he ſuppoſed Tradition) And as it is euidēt out of his epiſtles, and the hiſtories of that tyme, the queſtion betwixt him and S. Steeuen pope, was not whether Tradition were to be obſerued, or no, but whether this were a true Tradition or no. Wherin, S. Cyprian erronioufly thincking it to be a miſtaken tradition, argued againſt it as he did, demanding Scripture for proofe therof, which he would neuer haue done, if he had not thought it to haue bene miſtaken. The moſt therfore that Bel hath out of S. Cyprian for him ſelfe, is, that what is no true tradition, muſt be proued by Scripture, which I willingly graunt, but it maketh nothing for his purpoſe, as is euident.

99 untruth

S. Cyprian. Epiſt. ad Iubaian. ad Pompeium ad Quintinum. Euſeb. lib. 7. c. 3.

S. Auguſtin. lib. de vnic. bapt. c. 13. l. 1. de bapt. cōt. Donat. c. 18. 19. epiſt. 48. Vincent. Lyrin. contr. hæreſ.

7. But many things I obſerue in S. Cyprian which make againſt Bel. 1. He admitteth dyuers Traditions: Bel reiecteth al. 2. He impugneth one only Tradition: Bel impugneth al. 3. He erred in impugning one, and

and much more Bel in impugning al. 4. He recanted his error before his death as S. Auſtin thincketh, and of his fellow biſhops S. Hierom teſtifyeth: Bel perſiſteth obſtinatly. 5. He erred in a new queſtion, and not determined in a ful Councel ſaith S. Auſtin: Bel erreth in antient matters decyded by many general Councels. 6. He although he thought the Pope did erre, yet ſeperated not him ſelfe (as Bel doth) from his communion as him ſelfe and S. Hierom teſtifyeth. 7. He condemned none that followed the Popes opinion againſt his, as Bel doth. 8. He thought the Pope to erre in a cõmandment onely of a thing to be done: Bel condemneth him of errors in his iudicial ſentences of faith, where as S. Cyprian profeſſeth, *that falſe faith can haue no acceſſe to S. Peters chayre*: 9. He diſobeyed for a tyme the Popes commandement concerning a new, and difficult queſtion: Bel diſobeyeth obſtinatly his definatiue ſentence.

S. Auguſtin. l. 6. de bapt. c. 2.
S. Hieron. dial. contr. Luciferian.
S. Auguſt. l. de vnic. bapt. ſm. c. 13. & lib. 5. de bapt. c. 17.
S. Cyprian. epiſt. ad Iubaian.
S. Hieron. contr. Lucifer. Auguſt. ſup.
S. Cyprian. epiſtol. ad Pompei.
Euſeb. lib. 7. c. 5.
Vincen. cõt. hæreſ.
S. Cyprian. l. 1. epiſt. 3.

8. Hereby we ſee how litle S. Cyprian maketh for Bel, and though he had made more for him, let him know from S. Auſtin: lib. de vnic. bapt. c. 13. and lib 1. de bapt. cont. Donatiſt. c. 18. and epiſt. 18. that this error was in S. Cyprian. *an humane and venial error and like a blemiſh in a moſt white breaſt, becauſe it was not then perfectly defyned by the Church.*

See S. Auſtin lib. 2. contr. Creſcon c. 31. 32. to. 7. S. Auſtin.

But in his followers (saith he: lib. 1. cit. c. 19. *it is smoake of hellish filthines*, and as Vincent Lyrin writeth *The author was Catholicque, his followers are iudged heretiks, he absolued, they condemned, he a child of heauen, they of hel.* And let the Reader gather by this example, the authority of Tradition and Pope. For if one Tradition preuailed then against S. Cyprian, and a whole Councel of Bishops, alleadging dyuers places of Scripture, much more it wil preuaile against Protestants. And if the Popes iudgement euen then, when it seemed to many holy, and learned Bishops, to be against Scripture, & was supported only by Tradition, did preuaile, and they at last condemned as Heretickes, who resisted: much more it wil præuaile against Protestants, being vpholden not only by Tradition, but by manifest Scripture also. And Bel in blaming S. Steuē Pope, for prætēding (as he saith) false authority sheweth him selfe to bee a malepert minister, seeing S. Cyprian neuer reprehended him for any such matter: yea lib. 1. epist. 3. acknowledgeth in the Church one Priest, and iudge, who is Christs Vicar, meaning the Pope as is euident: because lib. 2. epist. 10. he saith that the Nouatiās in making a false Bishop of Rome, made a false head of the Church and l. 1. epist. 8. and epist. ad Iubaian: that Christ

Vincent. Lyrin.

Example of the force of tradition and the Popes iudgement.

So vntruth

S. Cyprian.

Christ builded his Church vppon S. Peter. And as for S. Steeuen, Vincent Lirin: highly commendeth him, and the very Donatists as S. Austin writeth, confessed, that *he incorruptly gouerned his Bishoprike.*

Vincent. Lyrin. con. hæres. S. Augustin. lib. de vnic. bapt. cont. Petil. c. 14. *Bel pag 97.* S. Athanas.

9. Next he cyteth S. Athanasius cont. Idol: saying *That Scriptures suffice to shew the truth.* True. But that truth wherof S. Athanasius there disputed against Gentils, to wit that Christ was God, as he him self explicateth in these words: *I speake of our beleefe in Christ.* But (saith Bel.) *He had made a foolish argument, and concluded nothing at al, if any necessary truth had not bene fully contained in Scripture.* As though S Athanasius had in these words argued against Gentils, in which he only gaue a cause why he wrote that treatise. Because (saith he) *Thogh Scriptures suffice to shevv the truth, and dyuers haue written of the same matter* (which argueth that he spake of some determinate truth) *yet because their writings are not at hand, I thought good to vvrite.* But suppose he had argued, what folly is in this argument? Al contained in Scripture is truth: Christs godhead is there contained. Ergo it is truth. But perhaps Bels dul head thought it al one to say. Al conteined in Scripture is truth (wherupon the said Syllogisme dependeth) & Scripture cõteineth al truth. As for S. Athanasius his reuerence of Tra-

S. Athanaſ. l. de Nicen. Synod. & epiſt. ad African. apud Theodoret. lib. 1. c. 8.

of Traditions, it is euident by his proouing the Godhead of Chriſt, and name of conſubſtantiality by Tradition, & by his words lib. de incarn. verbi; *who ſticketh to Traditions is out of danger.*

Bel pag. 98. S. Epiphan. hær. 61 Chapt. 1. pag. 8.

10. S. Epiphan he alleadgeth writing: *That We can tel the finding of euery queſtion by conſequence of Scripture.* But theſe words haue bene explicated before. As for Tradition, he ſaith hære. 61. *We muſt vſe it, for all things can not be taken out of Scripture, For the Apoſtles haue deliuered ſome things by Writing, ſome things by Tradition:* The like he ſaith hære. 55. and 75.

S. Epiphan.

S. Cyrill. lib. 2. de recta fid. ad Regin.

S. Cyril he citeth where he ſaith. *That We muſt followe Scriptures, & in nothing depart from their preſcript:* This maketh not againſt vs, who profeſſe ſo to doe, and yet withal follow Traditions. And what account S. Cyril made of Traditions appeareth by his obſeruing lent. lib. 10. in Ieuit. and vſe of the Croſſe. lib. 6. in Iulian. which are Traditions Apoſtolical as witnes S. Ambroſ. ſer. 25. 34. 36. Tertul. de corona mil. and others.

S. Cyril.

S. Ambroſ. Tertullian.

Bel pag. 98. Chryſoſt. in pſalm. 95.

11. He citeth S. Chriſoſtome writing *That if any thing be ſpoken without Scripture the hearers mynde Wauereth ſomtymes doubting, ſomtymes aſſenting, otherwhile denying.* But maruel it is that Bel would touch S. Chriſoſtome, who hom. 42. Theſal. vpon theſe words: (Holde Traditions) ſaith. *Hence it appeareth, that*

S. Chryſoſt.

that (the Apoſtles) *deliuered not all things by letters. And the one as well as the other are worthy of the ſame credit. Wherfore we thincke the Churches Traditions to deſerue beleefe. It is a Tradition* (marke Bel) *aske no more.* And if Bel had cyted the words immediatly before, he had explicated of what kinde of ſpeaking without Scripture S. Chriſoſtom meant, namely (*ſine teſtibus ſolaque animi cogitatione*) *Without Witneſſes, and of his owne head.* But Churches Traditions haue her for witnes, & deſcend from the Apoſtles. An other place he bringeth out of the ſame S, Chriſoſtom (as he ſaith) but it is out of the Author imperfect, who was a flat Arian, and therfore his teſtimony is worth nothing, otherwiſe then he agreeth with holy fathers: though his ſaying cyted by Bel: *That al is fulfilled in Scripture which is ſought to ſaluation, may be explicated by the firſt, or ſecond concluſion:*

Author imperf. hom. 41. in Math.

11. Next he bringeth S. Ambroſe *bidding vs not to beleeue argument, and diſputations, but aske the Scriptures, Apoſtles, Prophets, and Chriſt.* This maketh rather for vs; becauſe it alloweth enquiring of others beſides Scriptures, namely of Apoſtles from whom the Churches Traditions came. And nothing againſt Traditions, becauſe they be no arguments, or diſputations. And indeed S. Ambroſe meaneth of humane arguments, and reaſons ſuch

Bel pag. 98. S. Ambroſ. de fide ad Gratian. c. 4.

such as in the Chapter before he said the Arians vsed, to proue Christ to be vnlike to his Father Besides he speaketh only concerning one point vz. the consubstantiality of Christ. And therfore though he had bidden vs therin seeke only Scripture he had nothing preiudicated Traditions, which plainly he maintaineth ser. 2. 34. 36. 38. epist 81. and other where Only I maruel wherfore B. I corrupted S. Ambrose his words. For where he saith *We deny, yea abhorre* Bel maketh him say, *We deny not, but abhorre*, Making S. Ambros teach heresy in graunting Christ to be vnlike his Father, which was the matter he spake of, and to speake absurdly in abhorring a speech which he doth not deny.

S. Ambrof.

Corrupt of Fathers.

Bel pag. 99. S. Basil in Ethic. defin. vlt & ad Eustachium medicum.

13 S. Basil he citeth saying *what soeuer is (extra scripturam) out of the scripture seeing it is not of faith is sinne.* And in an other place. *Let vs stand to the iudgment of Scripture, and let the truth be iudged on their side, whose doctrine is agreeable to Gods oracles.* Answer. In the first place by *extra scripturam* he vnderstandeth things contrary to Scripture, as in the same place he vnderstandeth with the Apostle by *non ex fide* things contrary to faith, as appeareth. both because he saith such things are sinne, which is not true of things which are barely beside Scripture. as also because he proueth such

ſuch things to be ſinne, becauſe they be *non ex fide* contrary to faith, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh Rom. 14. v. 23. Beſide, by Scripture he vnderſtandeth al Gods words, as vſually we vnderſtand the whole by the cheefeſt part. Which may be proued, becauſe before he defined faith *to be certaine perſuaſion of Gods vvorde*, & affirmed it to a riſe of hearing Gods worde, and therupon inferreth, what is beſide Scripture is not of faith. In which illation, if he tooke not Scripture for Gods whole worde, as he did in the Antecedent, he did manifeſtly paralogize. And thus vnderſtood, he ſpeaketh nothing againſt Traditions, which are part of Gods worde, and as him ſelfe ſaieth otherwhere *of as equal force as the written Worde is.* S. Baſil. lib. de Spir. c. 27. & 29.

14. The ſecond place maketh nothing to the purpoſe. For he biddeth not vs be iudged by only Scripture, yea in allowing thoſe opiniõs for true, which are agreable to Scripture, he inſinuateth that to diſcerne the truth of opiniõs, it is not neceſſary to proue them out of Scripture, ſo they be conſonãt therero. How earneſt a defender of Traditions S. Baſil was, appeareth lib. de ſpir. c. 29. *I thincke* (quoth he) *it an Apoſtolical thing to ſticke vnto Traditions not* written and c. 27. *Some doctrine vve haue by Writing, ſome vve receaued of the Apoſtles Tradition, and both haue* S. Baſil.

equal force to piety. Nor any contradicteth theſe (marke Bel) *vvho neuer ſo ſtenderly haue experienced the rights of the Church* And c. 10. he writeth. *That Hereticks abolish Apoſtolical Tradition, and reiect vvritten teſtimonyes of Fathers as of no account.*

A Trick of Heretiks to reiect tradition.

Bel pag 99.

15. The laſt Father he citeth is S. Hierom, out of whom he alleadgeth three places. The firſt is in math. 23. *This becauſe it hath no authority from Scripture is as eaſely reiected, as it is affirmed.* The ſecond is in pſal. 86. where vpon that verſe *Dominus narrabit in ſcripturis populorum.* he ſaith. *God vvil shew not by Worde, but by Scripture, that excepting the Apoſtles, what is ſaid afterward shal haue no authority.* The third place is in Hierem. c. 4. *That we muſt not follow the error of our Auncеſtors or parents, but authority of Scriptures, and command of God teaching.* Anſwer: In the firſt place S. Hierom ſpeaketh of a perticuler opinion vz: That Zacharias who was ſlaine betwene the Temple and the Altar was S Ihon Baptiſts father: which he ſuppoſeth to haue bene no Apoſtolical Tradition, and therfore of it ſaith, becauſe it is not proued out of Scripture, it is as eaſely reiected as affirmed. But what S. Hierom writeth of a particuler opinion helde without tradition, Bel can not iuſtly extend to certaine Traditions. The ſecond place maketh nothing

S. Hierom.

againſt

againſt vs. Becauſe the Traditions of the Church were taught by the Apoſtles, and not by any other afterward. And S. Hieroms meaning is to deny, that any man may teach of his owne worde, and authority any new doctrine, as Montanus, and ſuch like Hereticks did, but only that, which they receaued from the Apoſtles, who were as S. Paul ſaith, Eph. 2. v. 20. *our foundation*. The thirde place maketh les to the purpoſe. For tradition is no error of Anceſtors. And Scripture we graunt to be followed, but not it alone, but (as S. Hierom ſaith) *the commandment of God teaching* whether it be by writing or tradition. As for traditions S. Hierom plainly alloweth them, Dialog. cont. Lucif. where he confeſſeth it *to be the cuſtome of the Church, to obſerue many things by tradition, as if they were written laws*. And epiſt. ad Marcel. receaueth lent. and lib. cont. Heluid: defendeth our Ladies perpetual virginity only by tradition. S. Hierome.

16. Many more Fathers I might alleadge for traditions. But I content my ſelfe with the teſtimonies of them, whom Bel brought for the contrary. Let the indifferent Reader weigh the places cited by him, and me, and vprightly iudge as he tendreth his ſaluation; Whether the holy Fathers reiected, or imbraced eccleſiaſtical traditions. Perhaps Bel

wil anſwer. That the Fathers contradict them ſelfes, and ſay as the falſe mother did.

3. Reg. 3. 7. 26. *Let them be nether myne nor thine, but be deuided.* But who remembreth Salomons iudgment, wil by this alone perceaue to whom of right the Fathers belong. I haue anſwered al that Bel hath brought out of them, and moſt of the authorities alleadged by me (eſpecially thoſe of S. Dioniſ. S. Epipha: S. Chriſoſt. S. Baſil) admit no anſwer at al: Now let vs come to Bels arguments out of Catholique writers.

Chap. V.

Bels arguments out of late Catholique vvriters touching ſufficiency of Scriptures and Traditions anſvvered.

Bel p. 100. Roffenſis artic. 57. Luther.

THE firſt he alleadgeth is the learned and holy Biſhop Fiſher (whom he vntruly tearmeth a canonized Saint with vs) Becauſe in one place he calleth Scripture *the ſtorehouſe of al truthes neceſsary to be known of Chriſtians.* And in an other ſaith *when hereticks contend with vs we ought to defend our cauſe with other help then Scripture. Becauſe* (ſaith Bel) *Popery can not be defended by Scripture, and auoucheth Papiſts to confeſſe, That they can not manteine their faith by Gods written word. Anſwer.* How

Veritate 4. cont. art. Lutheri.

vntruth 81.

Scri-

Scripture may be called a Store-house of al truths necessary to Christians, appeareth out of the first, and second Conclusion. And in the said place B. Fisher writeth of Purgatory. *That though it could not be proued out of Scripture, yet it ought to be beleeued for Tradition.* And in the secõd place he nether saith absolutly; That we ought not to proue our faith, out of Scripture at al, nether to Catholiks, nor to Heretiks: Nor that we ought not to proue it out of Scripture euen against Heretiks: For him selfe so proueth it against Luther, And much lesse saith. That we can not proue it out of Scripture (as Bel falsly forgeth) But his meaning is, That when we dispute with Heretiks, we ought to haue *aliud subsidium quam scripturæ*: other proofs beside Scripture, & hereof he geueth foure reasons. Sup. c. 1. parag. 2. & 7.

2. First becausse Luther professed to beleeue Purgatory though it were not in Scripture: 2. Becausse Scripturs in some points at the first sight, and in words seeme to fauor Heretiks more then Catholiques, as appeareth in the controuersy between S. Hierom, & Heluidius about our Ladies perpetual virginity 3. Becausse Heretiks deny many parts of Scripture. 4. Becausse though they admit the words, yet they peruert the sense and meaning of Scripture, which is as

much (saith Tertullian) as if they denied the words. And oftentimes the true sense is not so euident that it alone sufficeth to conuince an Heretik, when to contend about it *wearyeth* (as the same Tertullian writeth) *the constant, ouer turneth the weak, and scandalizeth the midle sort.* Wherupon he aduiseth vs wisely *That in disputing with Heretiks before we come to proofs out of Scripture, we try whose the Scriptures are, & to whose possession of, right they belonge. For that being cleared it will soone appeare* (saith he) *who hath the true Christian faith the true vnderstanding of Scripture, and al Christian Traditions.* And the same meant B. Fisher who also citeth Tertul. & his words make rather for Traditiõs then against them. And if this course were taken with Protestants, they wold be quickly confounded.

Sup. cap. 19.

Doue of Recusancy. p. 13.

For they (as Doue confesseth and it is euident) *had the Scriptures from vs*, not by gift, or loan; For we nether gaue nor lent them to Protestants; but by theaft, and stealth, as Turks and Infidels may haue them, and therfore are wrong vsurpers of our goods and possessions, and iustly may we say to them with Tertullian. *When & whence came you? what do you in my possession being none of myne? By what right Marcion* (Luther) *doest thou fel my wood? with what lycence Valentine* (Caluin) *doest thou turne a way my fountains;*

Supra c. 37.

with

With what authority Apelles (Beza) *doest thou moue my limits? It is my possession what do you others sowe, and feed at your pleasure? It is my possession, I possesse it of ould, I possesse it first, I haue strong originals from the Authors whose the thing was.* Thus Tertullian. And here I omit that Bel citeth an apocriphal sentence out of Esdr. 3. 4. vnder the name of the wise man as if it were Salomons.

3. Next he alleadgeth Canus his words. *Seeing the Canon of Scripture is perfect, and most sufficient to al things, What need the vnderstanding, and authority of Saints be adioined therto.* But Bel forgot to tel that Canus proposeth this only as an obiection; which he answereth by denying the illatiõ therin included. *Because* (saith he) *the Fathers, are needful to right vnderstand the Scripture,* Nether denying nor graunting the Antecedent concerning the perfection and sufficiency of Scripture. But how sufficient he thought Scripture to be: appeareth l. 3. c. 6. where (after S. Ignatius epist. ad Heronem) he calleth them wolues & Heretiks, which refuse the Churches Traditions and c. 7. soloeth the best arguments Protestans bring against them.

Bel p. 101. Canus de locis lib. 7. c. 3.

Canus.

4 Out of S. Thomas he citeth *that we must speak nothing of God which is not in Scripture, by words, or sense,* But this is nothing against Tradition of other things An other

Bel p. 102. S. Thom. 1. part. q. 36. art. 2.

place he citeth out of 3. p. q. 42. ar. 4. *Whatsoeuer Christ vvold haue vs read of his doings, and sayings, he commanded the Apostles to vvrite. as vvith his ovvne hands.* This also maketh nothing against vs. Both because S. Thomas saith not what Christ wold haue vs beleeue, but what he wold haue vs read, and Traditions be such as Christ wold haue vs beleeue, though we read them not, as appeareth by his Apostle 2. Thess. 2. v. 15. *Hold the Traditions vvhich you haue learnt, ether by speech or by my epistle.* As also because S. Thomas speaketh not of al points of beleefe, but only of Christs sayings, and doings, besids which the very sayings, and doings of the Apostles recorded in their acts, & epistles, or testifyed by Tradition, are to be beleeued. I omit a pettie vntruth, which Bel often repeateth. *That vve nether vvil nor can deny S. Thomas doctrin.* But S. Thomas his mynd concerning Traditions appeareth by his words. 2. Thess. 2. *It is euident that there are things vnvvritten in the Church, taught by the Apostles, and therfore to be kept: For as S. Dionis. saith. The Apostles thought it better to conceale many things.*

Vntruth 82

S. Thomas.

5. He citeth also Victoria saying. *I am not certaine of it, though al say it, vvhich is not contained in Scripture.* But Victoria meaneth of things spoken not by Tradition, but by proba-

Bel p. 101.

Victoria de Sacrament.

probable opinion, as the conception of our lady without original ſinne, and ſuch like: or he meaneth of things nether actually nor vertually conteined in Scripture, as Traditions be according to our 2. Concluſion cap. 1. An other place he alleadgeth out of Victoria writing, *That for opinions Wve ought no Wway to depart from the rule of Scriptures.* What is this to the purpoſe? Let Bel proue that we ether for opinions, or any thing els depart from Scripture, and let him not ſlander vs as he doth, *That Wve beleeue Wwhatſoeuer the Pope telleth Ws, though it be neuer ſo repugnant to Scripture.* For who shal be innocent if it ſuffice to accuſe. Victor. de augmento charitatis relect. 8. Bel p. 103. 83. vntruth.

6. Laſtly he quoteth S. Anſelme 2. Timoth. 3. and Lyra Math. 19. but omitteth their words, becauſe they make litle for him. S. Anſelm ſaith that Scripture, (and meaneth the old Teſtament) can make one ſufficiently learned to get ſaluatiõ, to keape the commandements, and what is more, is not of neceſſity but of ſupererogation. Which how litle it maketh againſt the beleefe of Traditions were ſupererogation to declare. And thus much touching the ſufficiency of Scriptures: now let vs entreat of their hardnes, or difficulty.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.
Of the Difficulty or easynes of Scriptures.

Scriptures. SCRIPTVRES are difficult, and hard to vnderstand. This is against Bel pag. *S. Peter.* 107. but expresly taught by S. Peter, 2. Pet. 3. v. 16. where speaking of S. Pauls epistles he saith. *In which are some things hard to be* *Bel p. 107.* *vnderstood.* To this Bel frameth three answers. First *that S. Peter saith not the whole Scripture is hard to vnderstand, but some things in S. Pauls epistles.* This is not to the purpose; because we say not that the whole Scripture, that is euery part thereof, is hard to vnder- *S. Chrysost. & Concion. 3. de Lazaro.* stand: But graunt with S. Chrysostom. 2. Thessal. hom. 3. *Whatsoeuer is necessary* (to euery mans saluation) *is manifest out of Scripture.* And with S. Austin lib. 2 doct Christ. *S. Austin.* c. 9. *All those things which concerne faith and manners are plainly set downe in Scripture.* And lib. 2. de pec. mer. & remiss c. vlt. tom. 7. *I beleeue euen in this point we should haue most cleare testimony of Gods word, if man could not be ignorant of it without losse of saluation.* Yet withal affirme with the same holy Doctor in psal. 140. *If Scripture were no where obscure it would not exercise vs.* And the like he saith *Lex partim in aperto est partim etiã inuelatis tegitur. Nazianz. orat. 2. de Theolog.* serm. 13. de verb. Apost. Only we affirme that

that absolutly the Scripture is hard, and to this it sufficeth that some places are hard. As for a way to be dangerous, it sufficeth that some places be perilous, though others be secure.

The Scripture absolutly hard though not every place thereof.

2. His second answer is: *That S. Peter only saith some places are hard to the vnlearned, vvhich are vnstable.* And like is his third answer. *That they are hard to the vvicked, vvhich depraue them.* But to answer thus is in deed to depraue Scriptures, and to shew him selfe to be one of the vnlearned, and vnstable, wherof S. Peter speaketh. For S. Peter absolutly saith some things in S. Pauls epistles are hard, not respectiuely to these or other kind of men *In vvhich* (epistles) saith S. Peter) *some things are hard to be vnderstood, vvhich the vnlearned, and vnstable depraue to their owne perditiõ.* Behold he saith not some things are hard to the vnlearned, and vnstable, but absolutly some things are hard, which hard things the vnlearned, and vnstable depraue. And as S. Austin saith lib. de fid. & oper. c. 14. one special hardnes meant by S. Peter in S. Pauls epistles is his difficult speech, and high commendation of iustifying faith, which now Protestants depraue to their owne perdition, in gathering therof that faith alone doth iustify, as some gathered in the Apostles tyme, against which opinion especial-

S. Peter.

S Augustin tom. 4.

XUM

S. Augustin. eit. especially (as the same holy Doctor witnesseth) S. Peter, S. Ihon S. Iames, and S. Iude writ their epistles: An other special difficulty meant by S. Peter (saith S. Austin ib. c. 16) are his words 1. corinth. 3. *If any build vpon the foundation.* &c.

See S. Chrysost. hom. 3. de Lazaro. tom. 2. S. Hierom. 3. Againe if Scripturs be not hard, what meant S. Philip to ask the Eunuch (who was as holy & studious a man as S. Hierom, ae he him selfe testifyeth epist. ad Paulin:) If he vnderstood them? What meant the Eunuch to answere. 6 *How can I if some do not shew me?* Could not an holy man so wise as he was, being Treasurer to the Q: of Ethiopia vnderstand easy matters? If Scripturs be so easy what need had K. Dauid to pray for vnderstanding to search Gods law: for opening his eyes to consider the wonders of it? what hapned to the Apostles that they could not vnderstād Christs parables? what needed the gift of interpretation giuen to some: 1. corinth. 12. v. 10. Nay al are interpreters if the Scripture be cleare to al.

Act. 8. v. 30. v. 31. *Psalm.* 118. v. 34. *Ib.* v. 18. *Math.* 13. v 36. c. 15. v. 16.

Fathers. Origen. lib. 7. cont. Celsum. 4. Origen saith that *Scripture is rerum multis in locis obscura, in very deed obscure in many places.* And that they take away the key of science, who say the Scripture is manifest:

S. Chrysost. hom. 40. in Ioannem. tom. 3. hom. 20. in Math. S. Chrysostom noteth, *That Christ bid not read, but search Scriptures, because summa indigent diligentia they need great study.*

ſtudy. S. Hierom writeth that al the epiſtle to the Romans *is nimys obſcuritatibus inuoluta wrapped in exceſsiue obſcurities.* That the Apocalips *hath as many miſteries as words.* S. Auſtin noteth, That to tame our pride ſome things are ſo obſcurely ſaid *as denſiſſimam caliginem obducunt they bring ouer a moſt thick darknes.* And wil Bel account that cleare which the gliſtering beam of Gods Church (for ſo Bel tearmeth S. Auſtin) accounted ſo dark and obſcure. And epiſt. 119. c. 21. profeſſeth to be ignorant of many more things in Scripture then he knoweth: If Bel after our holy Fathers, pleaſe to heare his owne vnholy lyers. Luther telleth him *that he is moſt impudently rash who profeſseth to know one book of Scripture in al points. By daily reading* (of Scripture ſaith Caluin. 3. inſtit. c. 2. parag. 4.) *we fal vpon many obſcure places which conuince vs of ignorance.* Nay to what purpoſe doth Bel require the commentaries of Fathers for better vnderſtanding of Scriptures, if there be no difficulty in them.

S. Hierom. epiſt. ad Algaſiam. q. 8.
Epiſtol. ad Paulin.
S. Auguſtin. l. 2. de doct. Chriſt. c. 6. See 12. Conf. c. 14 ſerm. 4. 5. 13. de verb. Apoſt. Iren. lib. 2. cap. 47. Cyrill. præfat. lib. theſaur.
S. Auguſtin. tom. 2.
Luther. præfat. in pſal.
Caluin. Quotidie legendo in multos obſcuros locos incidimus, qui nos ignorantiæ coarguunt.
Bel p. 102.

5. Finally if our cõmon lawes handling nothing but buying, ſelling, bargaining, and ſuch common, and vſual matters, as are daily practized of men, be ſo hard and difficult, as they require great ſtudy to be wel vnderſtood, and Clients wil giue great fees for

Reaſon.

for Lawyers counsel in them, what shal we thinke of Gods laws, which entreat of deuine, and supernatural things, far aboue mans reach, and capacity. Or if as S. Austin saith lib. de vtil. cred. c. 7. *He that hath no skil in poetry, dare not medle with Terentian Maurus without a maister, Asper, Cornutus, Donatus and infinit others are requisit to vnderstand any Poet, and doest thou without a guide rush vpon holy books ful of deuine matters?* O exceeding boldnes or rather madnes. And againe: *If euery art though base and easy require a teacher, or master to get it, What is more foolish heady pride, then not to learne the booke of deuine sacraments of their interpreters?* Now let vs heare Bels reasons to the contrary.

S. Augustin. tom. 6.

Ib. cap. vlt.

Bels Arguments. p. 108.

6. *Salomon* (saith he) *Prouerb.* 8. v 8. 9. *teacheth That the words of Wisdom are easy and open to euery one of vnderstanding.* But let vs heare Salomon him self. *All my speeches are iust, there is not in them any thing wicked or peruerse. They are right to such as vnderstand, and euen to such as find knowledge.* What word is here of easynes, or manifestnes of Gods words? but only of their vprightnes, and equity. And let Bel learne of S. Austin in psal. 146. to. 8. *That in Scripture there is nothing peruers, but some thing obscure.* But perhaps Bels english Byble deceaued him, which to deceaue the Reader vsed the ambiguity of the english word

Answer.

S. Austin.

Bille printed 1584.

word (plaine) which may signify ether manifest or euen) for the latin word (*æqui*)

7. After this Bel cyteth dyuers places of Scripture to proue That *God reuealeth his wil to al that fear him, to litle ones*: That the *doers of his wil know his doctrin and truth*. But seeing it is no where said That God reuealeth his wil, or the good know it, by bare reading his word, but rather the contrary; because *faith commeth of hearing, and how shal they heare without a preacher* Rom. 10. v. 17. 15. These places make nothing for easines of Scripture. Besids that they may be expownded, not of Gods wil in al points, but in such as are necessary to euery mans saluation, which we graunt to be plainly reuealed in Scripture. I omit his other places. That the Scripture *is a lanthern, light or candle*: and That *the spiritual man iudgeth, or* (as he expowndeth) *vnderstandeth al things*: for they be answered hereafter.

pag. 108.
Psal. 25. v. 9.
Ioan. 7. v. 17.
Ioan. 8. v. 31. 32.
Math. 11. v. 25.
S Paul.
Psalm 119. al. 118. v. 105.
2. Pet. 1. v. 19.
1. Cor. 2. v. 15.

8. He alleageth S. Chrisostom saying. *What need we a preacher? our negligence hath brought this necessity. For to what end is a sermon needful. Al things are clear and plaine out of Scripture: What things soeuer are necessary are manifest*: But S Chrisostom speaketh not of al things in Scripture, but only of such as are necessary to euery ones saluation, as is euident by his last words And such need no preacher

Cap. 9. parag. 17.
Bel p. 108.
S. Chrysost. hom 3. in 2. Thessalon.

preacher for to be vnderstood, though they need to be beleeued as S. Paule testifyeth Roman. 10. 17. But besides these there are things obscure as the same holy Doctor witnesseth in the same place in these words. *Thou knowest which are cleare, what askest thou the obscure?* And hom. 10. in Ioan. he biddeth men note *which is cleare which obscure in Scripture, and to harken the exposition of them in the Church.* And for such points, preachers, and preaching is as necessary now to vs, as wel for vnderstanding as for beleeuing them, as they were to the Eunuch. act. 8. to the two disciples Luc. 24. Other places he cyteth out of S. Chrysostome concerning reading of Scripture which shal be answered in his proper place.

S. Paul.

S. Chrysost. Item Conion. 3. de Lazaro.

Homil. 9. Coloss. and Concion. 3. de Lazaro.

9. What hath bene answered to the words of S. Chrysostom is to be applyed to the like in S. Austin lib. 2 de doct. Christ. c. 9. *In these things which are plainly set down in Scripture are found, al those things which concerne faith and manners.* For he saith not absolutly Al things: but al those things: therby insinuating that he meaneth only of things necessary to be beleeued, and done of euery one: which Bel perceauing in englishing his words leaft out the word. *Those.* But I maruel what he meant to cite S. Aust. writing: *The holy Ghost hath so tempered Scriptures*

S. Augustin. rom.

False translat.

S. Augustin. lib. de doct. Christ. c. 6.

ptures that locis apertioribus by manifester places (Bel translateth manifold places) *he might prouide for hunger* (desire of knowledge) *and by obscurer wipe away loathsomnes.* For here he plainly teacheth Scripture to be obscure in some places. But perhaps it is because S. Austin addeth. *Almost nothing is in the obscure places, which is not most plainly vttered otherwhere.* But this helpeth Bel nothing. For nether saith he that al obscurities are plainly other where explicated. Nor that it is plaine in what places they are explicated. And so S. Austin admitting some obscure places of Scripture to be no where explicated in Scripture, and supposing it not to be plaine in what places such obscure places as are explicated, be explicated, admitteth Scripture to be obscure. An other place he citeth out of S. Austin, as also S. Hierom and Theodoret concerning reading of Scripturs, which shal be answered in the next chapter. *Bel p.* 111. 112. 113.

Chap. VII.

Of the vulgar peoples reading Scripture.

First conclusion, it is not necessary to al sorts of people, that desire to attaine to eternal life to read Scripturs. The con-

trary auoucheth Bel pag. 103. & 109. wherin he exceedeth the heretike Pelagius who required not reading, but only knowledge of Scripture for to be without sinne, & therby condemned a great part of Christians as S. Hierom writeth dialog. 1. cont. Pelag. But it is so manifest as it needeth no proofe. For how should they doe that can not read? Doth Bel thinke Scripture to be like a neck verse, that who can not read it, shal be hanged? where doth God command euery one vpon paine of death to read Scripturs? whence came this new law which Bel proclaimeth? But marke Reader, Protestants taught at first that no works were necessary to saluation. And now Bel auoucheth one more (vz. reading of Scripturs) then euer Catholiques dreamed on.

S. Hierom.

2. Second conclusion, It is not expedient for euery one of the vulgar sort to read Scripturs. This I proue because vnlearned, and vnstable persons depraue the Scripture to their owne perdition. Many of the vulgar sort are vnlearned, and vnstable. Therfore many of them ought not to read Scripture. The Minor is euident. The Maior is auerred by S. Peter 2. c. 3 v. 16. and proued by daily experience of new Christs, new Iewes, new hereses daily gathered out of Scripture. And in truth the Protestants counselling

See S. Gregor. Nazianzen. in Apologet. & orat. 1. de Theolog.

Hacket. More. Ket Hammont. See Stovv Ann. 1561. 1579.

ling of common people to read Scriptures, is much like to the Diuels perſwading of Eue to eat the Apple. He asked Eue why God forbad her to eat? they aske: why the Church forbidderh vs to read? And both anſwering alike: He replyeth you shal not die but become like Gods. They ſay you shal not fal into errors, but become like Deuines. And the euent is like in both. Eue by eating fel out of Paradiſe, and incurred death: ſimple people by reading dye in ſoule, & fal out of the Church.

3. But ſaith Bel, A good should not be taken wholy from the godly for fault of the bad. Anſwere. The godly are not debarred from reading Scripture if they be deſyrous, and iudged by their Paſtors to be ſuch as wil reape good therby. Neuertheles they ought not without lycence, leſt as S. Auſtin writeth in the like caſe. *Though they hurt not themſelfs by reading, they may hurt others by example. As he that could fly be made to go leſt his example prouoke others to ſo perilous attempt. This* (ſaith he) *is the prouidence of true religion*, and *deliuered from our Auncestors, and to alter this courſe were nothing els then to ſeeke a ſacrilegious way to true religion.* Moreouer though a thing be good in it ſelfe, yet it is not good but to ſuch as know how to vſe it; But euery one of the common people knoweth not how

Bel p. 107.

S. Auguſtin. lib. de vtilit. credend. c. 10. tom. 6.

S. Nazianz. orat. Quod non liceat semper & publice de Deo contẽdere. In Apologetico.

to vse Scripture. For as Gregory Nazianzen writeth *The vvord of holy vvritt is not so base, that it is open to the vnlearned common sort, and seely men creeping as yet vpon the ground.* And againe *To some it is better to be taught by others.* And S. Hierom complaineth that euery one challengeth the knowledge of Scripture, and *that the chatting old vvife, the doating old men, and the prating Sophister take it in hand.* What wold he say now if he saw Protestants children reading Scripture, and taught to read english by the Byble? Now let vs see Bels obiections.

S. Hierom. epistol. ad Paulin.

See Theodoret. lib. 4. c. 17.

Bel p. 103. 104.

4. Bel alleadgeth S. Chrisostom as affirming 1. *That if we read Scripture seriously we shal need no other thing.* 2. That it is a great shame for men charged with wife and children only to heare sermons, and not withal to study Scriptur. 3. *That many euils come of ignorance of scripture, as heresies, and dissolute life.* Answer. The first point is not against vs, who graunt that in reading Scripture we may find al things necessary. But the question now is whither it be better for euery one to find such things him selfe out of Scripture or no. As for the second point S. Chrisostom only saith that it is a shame not to exact more diligence of men in hearing sermons, then in gathering mony. *At lest* (saith he) *be ready to heare what others haue gathered,*

S. Chrysost. proœm. ep. ad Rom.

gathered, and beſtovv ſo much diligence in hearing vvhat is ſaid as in gathering mony. For though it be a ſhame to exact but ſo much of you, yet wil we be content if you performe ſo much. The third point is eaſely anſwered: becauſe he ſaith not: That much miſcheef commeth of not reading (as Bel falſly affirmeth pag. 105) but of not knowing the Scripture: vz. if men wil nether read it them ſelfs, nor heare it readd and expounded by preachers. Nether could he thinke that much miſcheef can come of not reading Scripture, if ſo be it be heard, ſeeing he promiſeth to be content if men wil heare it.

Innumera mala nata ſunt quod ſcripturæ ignorantur. Chriſt. ſup. *vnſtruth* 84

5. An other place he citeth out of S. Chriſoſtom where he exhorreth men *auſcultare lectionem ſcripturæ* to harken to the reading of Scripture. And againe: *At home to apply them ſelfes to read Scripture.* Anſwer. The firſt part maketh nothing for reading, but only for hearing Scripture as is euident. The ſecond exhorteth to reading but 1. not euery man woman, & child as Proteſtants do, but men, and namely ſuch who (as he ſaith proem. epiſt. ad Rom.) *haue wiues, charge of children, and family.* And hom. 9. Coloſ. *Hear you* (ſaith he) *who liue in the vvorld, haue care of vvines and children*: *who* (as he writeth conc. 3. de Lazaro) *haue publicke offices, maintein wiues, and children.* And yet Bel wil haue

Bel p. 105. S. Chryſoſt. homi. 29. in 9. c. Geneſ. tom. 1.

Differences betvvixt S. Chryſoſt and Proteſtants. 1.

Bel p. 110.

him to ſpeake to both ſexes as if both ſexes had wiues. As for woemen and children he affirmeth *That they ought to be inſtructed of men.*

Hom 9. ad Coloſ. & hom. 37. 1. Cor.

2. 6. Secondly he exhorteth not (as Proteſtants do) al kind of ſecular men, to wit vnſtable (as S. Peter calleth them) and inconſtant in their faith. For ſuch are like rather to depraue Scripturs to their perdition (as S. Peter teſtifyeth) then to reape good by reading them.

2. Peter. 2. c. 3. v. 16.

3. Thirdly the ſecular men whom he exhorteth, he exhorteth not (as Proteſtants do) to the reading equally of al parts of Scripture, but eſpecially ſuch as are plaine, and eaſy, namely hiſtories, as appeareth by theſe his words 2. Theſſ. hom. 3. *But thou vvilt ſay they are obſcure, What obſcurity is this? I pray thee are there not Hiſtories? Thou knoweſt which are cleare, what askeſt thou of the obſcure places? There are a thouſand Hiſtories in Scripture tel me one of them.*

3.

S. Chryſoſt.

4. 7. Fourthly he exhorteth them not abſolutly (as Proteſtants do) in al tymes, without regard of any occaſion or circumſtance: but ſeeing the people of Conſtantinople (to whom he preached) giuen (as he ſaith) to diſſolute life, to idlenes, to haunting after diſhoneſt shewes, and riot, for to withdraw them from ſuch vice, and to imploy their tyme better, he exhorted them to buy

4.

Proæm. ep. ad Rom.

to buy Bybles, and to read the Scripture; and vpon this occasion he said. *That the Apostle commanded to read the Scriptures diligently* Homil. 9. Coloss. circ. And in like sort seeing their children to haue learnt diuelish songs and dances (as he learneth them) for to take such from them he biddeth men *to teach them to sing psalmes.* Ibid. But how things ought absolutly to proceed, he vttereth in these words vnto men. *Vos oportebat duntaxat à nobis institui, Vxores vero à vobis, à vobis & liberos*: you ought only to be instructed of vs, but your wiues, & children of you. Ibid. And 1. Corinth. hom 37. he saith: That S. Paul appointed men to teach their wiues, as indeed he did in these words. *If they* (woemen) *list learne any thing let them aske their owne husbands at home.* 1. Corinth. 14. v. 35. S Paul. And the like he hath 1. Tit. 2. Behould S. Paul bids woemen learne of their husbands. Bid bids them read, and learne of Scripture, let woemen chuse whether they wil follow.

8. Fifthly: he exhorteth not secular men to read Scriptures with that mynd, and purpose, which Protestants doe, to wit vpon curiosity, and to become their owne interpreters following their owne priuate spirits, and thereby to iudge of the doctrine of the Church, and their Pastors, whome Christ hath giuen to expound Scripturs, *lest* 8. *A mayne difference betweext S. Chrysost. and Protestants.*

Ephes. 4. v. 14. *they should be carryed away with al wind of doctrine.* But S. Chrysostoms meaning was, that reading Scriptures for their confort (as he writeth hom. 9. cit.) in aduersity, for auoyding of vice, and such like holy purposes, they should expound them according to their Pastors instruction: *you* (saith he) *ought to be instructed of vs*, and the Author imperfect. hom. 43. in Math. amongst other means, which he prescribeth to lay men to know the truth of Scripture, one is to aske the Priests whome he calleth *clauicularios scripturarum*, key keepers of Scripturs. which is the right order prescribed by God him selfe Deutr. 17. v. 9. Agg. 2. v. 12. and Malach. 2. v. 7. And the contrary course obserued by Protestants, maketh Christ to haue giuen vs needles Pastors, and Doctors, bidding vs heare them as him selfe, maketh euery one his owne Pastor, and to haue the gift of interpretation contrary to S. Paul 1. Corinth. 12. v. 10. 30. And by this which hath bene said is answered, whatsoeuer Bel alleadgeth out of S. Chrysost. pag. 108. 109. 111. and he found to be quite against Protestants, and nothing against Catholiques proceedings. And though S. Chrysostom had giuen far more lyberty to common people to read Scriptures, then now the Church doth, as not hauing then experience

See S. Chrysost. homil. 10. in Ioan. & 3. de Lazaro. Origen. 4. in Leuit. Autor imperfecti.

Deuter. Aggæ. Malach.

Ephes. 4. v. 11. 1. Cor. 12. v. 28. Luc. 10. v. 16.

Note this.

rience of the harme redounding thereof, what maruel if the Church, finding by the experience of more then a thowſand years ſince S. Chryſoſtoms tyme, that more harme then good commeth therby, hath abridged that lycence? For as S. Auſtin ſaith Epiſt. 50. Experience of many euils maketh many medicins to be found. S. Auguſtin. tom. 2.

9. Now let vs heare what Bel replyeth againſt this kind of anſwering to S. Chryſoſtoms authority. Firſt he ſaith, *That the doctrine in the pulpit ought to be as true as in the Schoole.* This is true, but not to the purpoſe, becauſe we reproue not S. Chryſoſtom of vttering vntruths in the pulpit. Next he ſaith, *That the doctrin in the pulpit ought to be as exact, and abſolute as in the ſchoole, and the only difference is, that in the pulpit it hath the pricke of exhortation, which is wanting in ſchools.* What Syr? Are theſe ſpeeches of S. Chryſoſtom cited by your ſelfe. *What need a ſermon? What need a preacher?* as exact, and abſolute as can be deliuered in ſchools? Surely then your preaching is needles, and conſequently the fifty pound penſion giuen to you for it, may be wel ſpared. Yea if the doctrin of pulpit, and ſchools be of like exactnes, certes the auditors in both places are of like capacity, and ſo Bels deuines be no better ſchollers then his common people. *Bel p.* 116. 1. 2. S. Chryſoſt. hom. 3. in 2. Theſſalon. *Bel p.* 108.

10. But

Bel knowveth not vvhat belongeth to a sermon.

10. But little knoweth he what belongeth to sermons, who thinketh them to differ from schoole doctrine in nothing but in exhortation. Are amplifications, hyperboles, and like figures excluded as wel from pulpits, as from schools? Are the same parts prescribed to be in a lecture by school men, which are by Orators to be in a sermon or oration. Doth Bel exact as strong proofs, and like propriety of words of an orator, or preacher persuading probably, and accommodating him selfe to the capacity of his hearers, as he doth of a Philosopher, or Deuine teaching dogmatically. Sure I am that both Aristotle, and common sense reach contrary. But Bel euery where sheweth him selfe to be one of them, *who* (as S. Paul saith) *vnderstand not what they say, or of what they talke.*

Aristotel. 1. Ethic.

1. Timoth. 1. 7. 7.

11. Againe suppose that S. Chrysostom had spoken of this point, as exactly in the pulpit as any Diuine can in schools: what followeth thereof? Forsooth that Bels proposition vz. *That al persons of what sexe, state, calling, or condition soeuer, may, and ought to read Scriptures, and can not otherwise attaine to eternal life*, passeth exact speech, and albounds of truth. Because S. Chrysostom hath no such exact words: yea the words which Bel wresteth to his purpose S. Chrysostom

pag. 103.

ſoſtom him ſelfe otherwiſe expoundeth as hath bene shewed. And thus much of Bels ſecond reply to the foreſaid anſwer.

12. *Thirdly* (ſaith he) *Dauid, and the Berheans, had no regard of this popish diſtinction of more exact ſpeech vttered in ſchools, then in pulpit. Becauſe Dauid Pſalm.* 119. *v.* 9. *affirmeth. That a yong man shal cleanſe his waies by ſtudy, meditation, and keeping of Gods lavv. The Berheans ſearched the Scriptures, and examined the Apoſtles doctrine by them. Anſvver.* Dauid ſaith: A yong man shal correct his waies by keeping Gods lawes. But *ſtudy, and meditation* are added by Bel, I wonder he added not alſo *reading*. But ſuppoſe Dauid had ſaid. That a yong man amendeth his life by reading Scripture, shal we infer that he thought preachers ſpeake as exactly as Schoolmen? The like reaſon is the other. The Berheans examined the Apoſtles doctrine by Scripture. Ergo they thought the doctrine of the pulpit as exact as the ſchoole: O wit whither wilt thou? But of the Berheans fact we shal ſpeake more hereafter.

3. pag. 116.

Corrupt. of Script.

Pſalm 118. al. 119. 9.

Chapt. 11. pag. 4.

13. After this Bel falleth to entreat in perticuler of woemens teaching, and reading Scriptures, propounding vnto him ſelfe this obiection of Catholiques. *S. Paul will haue Woemen to learne in ſilence, and permitteth*

Of woemens teaching and reading Scripture.

Bel p. 116. mitteth them not to teach. 1. Timoth. 2. v. 12. & answereth, That though S. Paul permit them not to teach publikly before men, yet he forbiddeth them not to read Scripture, nor to teach priuatly where due circumstances occurre, because Bethsabe taught Salomon, Priscilla expounded Scriptures to Apollo, Eunice, and Lois instructed Timothy in Scriptures. Here Bel is ashamed to lycence woemen to teach publikly before men, though he was not to make one of them head of the Church, which is a far greater matter, and necessarily includeth authority to teach the Church publikly: but whether they may teach publikly before woemen, or priuatly before men, and what the due circumstances are, when they may teach priuatly, he setteth not downe. Nether do I thinke his Protestant sisters wold regard them, who publikly before men at table, and in their assemblies in houses, take vpon them to expound Scriptures. Surely he should do wel to informe his sisters of his circumstances. But as for S. Paul he giueth them no lycence at al to read, or to teach Scriptures, (excepting the case of perticuler inspiration, or of necessity, when they are permitted also to baptize.) For he in the foresaid words not only forbiddeth them absolutly to teach, but withal appointeth them to learne, as if this alone were

Prouerb. 31. 7. 1.
Act. 18. 7. 26.
2. Timoth. 1. v. 5. & c. 3. v. 15.

Heretical woemen how malepert. who dare teache?
Tertull. l. de præscript.
Some preached publikly in Germany.
Sur. An. 1522.

were their duety, and belonged to them. And leſt we should thinke they might learne of them ſelfs by reading Scriptures, he explicateth 1. Corinth. 14. v. 35. both of whome, and where they muſt learne: vz. of their husbands, and priuatly at home. *If they liſt to learne* (ſaith he) *any thing, let them* (not read Scriptures) *aske their husbands at home*. Behold woemen appointed not to teach ether publikly, or priuatly, but to learne, and that priuatly at home, and of their husbands. And the ſame ſaith S. Chriſoſtom. hom. 9. in epiſt. ad Coloſſ. S. Hierom dialog. 1. contr. Pelag. where he reprehendeth the Pelagians for licenſing their woemen to ſing with them, (as Proteſtants do now, and Bel paſſeth in ſilence) and ſaying they ought to be skilful in Scripture. But no maruel if Proteſtants being ſo womanish, as they profeſſe they can no more liue without them, then without meat, or drinke, and hereſies haue bene euer ſpred by fauour, and helpe of woemen (as S. Hierom ſaith epiſt. ad Cteſiphontem) be more liberal to woemen, then the Apoſtle, who ſaid *it was good not to touch them*. 1. Cor. 7. v. 1.

S. Paul.

S. Chryſoſt. S. Hierom.

Luther. de vo. coiug. Aſſert. artic. 16. vid. ſerm. de matrimon. edit. VVitembergenſ. fol. 116.

S. Paul.

14. The examples alleadged by Bel for woemens teaching are partly falſe, partly not to the purpoſe. For Bethſabees words came

came ether from Gods perticuler inspiration, and so her teaching maketh not to the purpose, or from her owne head, and so she taught not Gods word, though what she said being after recorded by Salomon, became Gods worde. Priscilla is not said act 18. v. 16. (as Bel affirmeth) to haue expounded Scriptures, but the way of the Lord, to Apollo: which she might do without expounding Scripture, as S. Iohn prepared the way of the Lord, without preparing Scripture. That of Eunice, and Lois is vncertaine. For albeit it be said 2. Timoth. 1. v. 5. *That they were faithful woemen*, and c. 3. v. 15. that *Timothy was instructed from his infancy in Scripture*. Yet it is not said he was instructed of them, but might wel be instructed of some other at their procuremēt (as it is vsual for to hyre maisters to teach children) wherfore fondly doth Bel auouch it to be cleare, and euident by their example, that mothers must teach, and yong babes learne Scripture.

Luc. 1. v. 76.
Matth. 3. v. 3.

15. But suppose that they taught their childe, or grandchild for want of sufficient men to teach, (as may be presumed, because his father was a Gentil. Act. 16. v. 13) what is this to woemen teaching without al necessity priuarly whome soeuer, euen their husbands, contrary to the prescript, and

and order ſette down by S. Paul: yea ſuppoſe that Bethſabe, Priſcilla, Eunice, and Lois had without perticuler inſpiration, or neceſſity (which Bel can not proue) taught men priuatly Scriptures, who ſeeth not, but that S Paul knew better woemens duety then they, and that we ought rather to follow his preſcript, and order, then the example of two or three woemen, not the learnedeſt, nor greateſt Clerks.

16. After this Bel alleadgeth Origen for proofe of common peoples reading Scripture, and affirmeth him to exhort the people to read Scriptures, becauſe he writeth. *If we can not al things, let vs at leſt remember that we are now taught, or is rehearſed in the Church.* But Origen here exhorteth the people only to remembring, *at leſt* (ſaith he) *thoſe things which are taught and rehearſed this day in the Church*, to wit by eccleſiaſtical perſons. He bringeth likewiſe S. Auſtin exhorting his people *not only to heare diuine leſſons in the Church, but alſo at home to read them ſelfs, or to heare others.* Wherupon Bel noteth. *That we muſt read Scriptures at home in our houſes, and not heare them read in the Churches*, which note is more abſurd then I need refel, yet let the Reader remember it. But S. Auſtins ſpeech was not to al kind of men, nor at al tymes, but to his owne people, whome

Bel p.107.

Origen. homil. 4. in Leuit.

Bel p.111.

S. Auguſtin. ſerm 55. de tempore.

Groſſe abſurdity of Bel.

XUM

whome he knew were like to encreaſe their deuotion in the holy tyme of lent (whereof he ſpake) by reading Scripture. And the like exhortation may any Catholique Bishop make to his flocke, whome he knoweth not to haue, *itching eares, and not to be ſoone conuerted to fables*, & yet withal condemne the promiſcual licence graunted by Bel to al ſorts of people, of what ſexe, ſtate, calling, or condition ſoeuer. For ſo the vnlearned, and vnſtable be licenced, yea *neceſsarily ought* (ſaith Bel) *to read Scripture*, though (as S. Peter teſtifyeth) *they wil deprane it to their owne perdition.*

2. Timoth. 4.7.4.

pag. 103.

2. Pet. 2. c.3. v. 16.

17. And ſuch conſtant Catholiques were thoſe men, and woemen, *which* (as S. Hierom writeth) *did ſtriue, who ſhould learne moſt Scriptures, and whome he exhorted to learne the Scripture without booke, and to haue it alwaies in their hands, and to teach it their children.* For as him ſelfe writeth epiſt. ad Gaudent. cit. *what we ſpeake we ſpeake not in general, but in part, nor ſay of al, but of ſome.* And epiſt. ad Paulin. reprehendeth greatly. That euery one ſhould take Scripture in hand. Wherfore if Bel apply S. Hieroms words to al ſorts of perſons of what condition ſoeuer, he doth not only againſt the holy Doctors meaning, but sheweth him ſelfe to be a foolish Phiſition preſcribing the like

3. Hierom. in pſalm. 133. Epiſtol. ad Gaudent. & epiſt. ad Celantiam.

Bel like a foolish Phiſition.

like diet to al kinde of persons: not knowing who *can eat milk*, but *not solid meat* (as the Apostle speaketh 1. Corinth 3. v. 2. Hebr. 5. v. 12. For some (as he saith Hebr. 5. v. 11.) *are weake to heare some part of Gods word*, and much weaker wold be to read it al. Wherfore the Catholique Church (like a prudent nurse) permitteth such children, as she seeth strong, and able, to read Scripturs, to feed them selfs, and cut their owne meat, but to such as she perceaueth to be weake, and not so able, she wil not graunt the like liberty, but cheweth their meat, or cutteth it her selfe by preaching, & expoũding Scripturs to them, lest if they were their owne caruers, they should hurt them selfs. And Protestants like careles nurses, let al alike carue them selfs, and therby cut their owne fingers, yea throats, & kil them selfs by taking oftentymes poison insteed of meat.

18. And hereupon I must aduertise the Reader of two vntruths, which Bel fathereth vpon Catholiques vz. *That they deeme, them most holy, who can by hart no Scripture at al, but abstaine from reading therof, as from poison of their soules.* For ignorance of Scripture in it selfe we account no holynesse at al, and much lesse deeme them most holy who know lest of Scripture. But great holines

Bel p. 111.

vntruth 85

vntruth 86

Ignorance of it self no holynes.

we esteeme it, to chuse rather harmles ignorance, then curious, and disobedient skil. As great holines it had bene in Eue, to haue made choise rather of ignorance of good, and euil, then of knowledge therof. And the like ignorance of Scripture in Catholiques we preferre before Protestants knowledge. For to be thus ignorant (saith Tertullian) *is better, lest we know that we should not. Faith* (saith he) *shal saue vs, not exercise in Scripture. Faith is commanded, exercise in Scripture consisting in curiosity hath glory only in study of knowledge. Let curiosity giue place to faith, let glory yeeld to saluation.* Thus Tertullian a most antient writer, whose counsel I wold to God Protestants did follow. And as for Scripture we account it no poison, but the food of life, and the reading therof good and holsome, if it be done as it should, not vpon curiosity, and disobedience to the Churches precept, as the Aple was good in it selfe, and the eating therof had not bene hurtful, if it had not bene against Gods commandement.

Bonum ipsum viliter aliquando ignoratur. S. Augustin. l.6.cont.Iul. c.16.

Tertull l. de præscript.

19. Bel citeth also Theodoret writing. *That the Hebrew books are turned into al languages.* Againe, *That we may find ditchers, and neatheards, and planters reasoning of the Trinity, and creation of al things.* Answer. That of the Scripturs translation shal be answered in the

Bel p. 113. Theodoret. lib.5. de Græcan. affection.

the next chapter. The other proueth no more then that ſimple people knew the ſaid miſteries, whereof, he ſaith not, they read, but reaſoned. And S. Gregory Nazianzen. greatly diſcommendeth ſuch for it. And by the like reaſon, might Bel proue euery Catholique to read Scripture. Becauſe (as Bellarmin ſaith truly:) *Catholique ruſticks, and woemen, though they vnderſtand not the ſentences of Scripture, yet they vnderſtand the miſteries of our redemption, and can reaſon of them*, yea better then many Proteſtants, who dayly read Scripture. *But* (ſaith Bel) *why are not al permitted to read Scripture, if al can vnderſtand therein the miſteries of our redemption.* And like to one that hath no thing to doe, proueth a needles matter, that the knowledge of the miſteries of our redemption, is neceſſary, and ſufficient to ſaluation, though in the next page before he noted *that al things conteined in the written worde*, (which no doubt are more then the miſteries of our redemption) *are neceſſary for al people.* But omitting Bels contradiction: To his argument out of Bellarmin: I anſwer that Bellarmin affirmeth not (as Bel impoſeth.) That al can vnderſtand the miſteries in the Scripture, but rather the contrary, when he ſaith. *That many vnderſtand not the ſentences of Scripture.* And though al could vnderſtand

S. Greg. Nazianz. orat. 1. de Theol.

Bellarm. lib. 2. de verbo Dei. c. 4.

Bel p. 115.

Contradict. 18.

vntruth 87

the misteries in Scriptures, yet al were not to be permitted to read them, becauſe al haue not (as S. Paul writeth) *their ſenſes exerciſed to the diſcerning of good and euil:* al are not perfect to haue wiſdome ſpoken amongſt them: al are not to be inſtructed as ſpiritual, but ſome as carnal: Al wil *not be wiſe to ſobriety, but ſome more wiſe then behoooueth them.* Rom. 12. v. 3. Finally al are *not capable of ſolid meat, but ſome of milke only.*

Hebr. 5. v. 14.
1. Cor. 2. v. 5.
1. Cor. 3. v. 1.
Rom. 12. v. 3.
1. Cor 3. v. 2.
Hebr. 5. v. 12.

Chap. VIII.
Of the tranſlation of Scripture into vulgar tongues.

Scripture not to be vſed commonly in vulgar tongues.

It is not expedient to haue or vſe commonly Scriptures in vulgar languages. This is againſt Bel p. 106. but it followeth of that which hath bene proued in the former Chapter. For if it be not expedient abſolutly for the vulgar ſort to read Scripture, it is not expedient that it be common in vulgar tongues; leſt ſome like foolish Eue be tempted by the ſight thereof, curiouſly and againſt command to read it. Secondly becauſe neither the Iewes, after their language was corrupted by their captiuity, tranſlated the Scripture into their vulgar language. Nor the Church euer commanded the Scriptures to be tranſlated into euery

euery vulgar tongue, but generally vſed them in Hebrew, greeke, and latine, in which tongs they were written. As for the English Bybles tranſlated by Proteſtants, they al hitherto haue bene naught, as them ſelfs confeſſe, and are now about a new tranſlation, which hereafter perhaps wil be found as faulty as the former. Whereby we ſee that the English faith hitherto hath bene falſe, as builded vpon the English Bible, which was falſe, and conſequently who dyed in it, dyed in a falſe faith, and relyed vpon mans worde in ſteed of Gods. And this is the true death which common people haue incurred, and al the good they haue reaped by reading Scriptures in English, according to the ſerpentine counſel of Miniſters. For where before they knew ſo much of Gods worde, as was ſufficient to ſaluation, by reading English Bibles they haue read a lying worde, as now after 46. years experience they both ſee, and confeſſe, and becauſe they would not content them ſelfs with knowledge ſufficient to ſobriety, and ſaluation, but as the Apoſtle writeth Rom. 12. v. 3.) *be more wiſe then behooued them, God hath ſent them* (as the ſame Apoſtle ſaith) 2. Theſſ. 2. v. 11. *the operation of error to beleeue lying.*

See Conference at Hampton Court. pag. 45. 46. 47.

The good which Proteſtants haue gotten by English Bibles.

S. Paul.

2. Againſt this Bel obiecteth: *That the* Bel p. 106.

1. Cor. 14. v. 24. *Apostle calleth them madde who read the Ghospel to people in a language vnknovvne to them, and the people also that listen therto as Catholiques doe.* Answer. The Apostle is so far from condemning seruice of God in a tongue vnknowne to the hearers, as he saith to such a one. *Thou doest vvel.* 1. Corinth. 14. v. 17. But indeed he saith, That if Ideots and infidels hard vs so doing they wold say we were madde. *If al the Church meet together* (saith he) *and al speake vvith tongues, and Ideots or infidels enter, vvil they not say that you are madde?* 1. Corinth. 14. v. 23. Whetfore not S. Paul, but onely Ideots or infidels cõdemne the Churches seruice in an vnknowne tongue.

Only Idiots and infidels condẽne seruice in an vnknovvne tonge.

Luc. 1. v. 10. & 11. 3. And if the sacrifice and prayer of Zachary (which the people did not so much as heare or see) did greatly profit them, why may not the sacrifice, and prayers of Priests, which the people both see, and heare, greatly profit them, though they vnderstand them not. And if Bel wil excuse Zachary, and the Iewes, (yea God who commanded it Leuit. 16.) from madnes though they stood without dores, and could nether heare, nor see, and much les vnderstand the sacrifice, and prayers. Much better (if he please) may he excuse Catholiques who both see, and heare, and parrly vnderstand the Catholique seruice. And though

though Bel ſcoffe at Catholiques, liſtening to the Ghoſpel redde in latine. Yet Origen hom. 20. in Ioſue writeth, *That with only hearing Scripture, though we doe not vnderſtand it, the poiſon of naughty ſpirits, which beſiege vs, is driuen away as it were with a prayer, and holy ſpirits are inuited to helpe vs. For* (ſaith he) *If Words of conjuration pronounced, though not vnderſtood, worke inchantments, how much more vertue thinke we haue the Words of holy Scripture.* And if S. Chryſoſtom hom. 3. de Lazar. might ſay, *That though we vnderſtand not Scripture, yet ex ipſa lectione multa naſcitur ſanctimonia, much holines riſeth by very reading,* Why may we not ſay the like of very hearing? And becauſe Bel vrgeth this obiection no farther, I anſwer it no fuller, who liſt ſee more of it, let him read Rhemiſt. 1. Corinth. 14. D. Stapleton vpon the ſame place, and Bellar. l. 2. de verb. Dei c. 16.

Origen. *The Diuels words not vnderſtood worke euil Ergo Gods words not vnderſtood do good.* S. Chryſoſt.

4. B. I obiecteth out of Theodoret, *That the Hebrew books were tranſlated into al languages.* This is nothing againſt vs, who deny not but Scripture hath bene, and may be, vpon iuſt and vrgent cauſes tranſlated into vulgar languages, ſo it be not vulgarly vſed, and common to al kinde of vulgar people: And here by the way, I muſt aduertiſe the Reader of dyuers vntruths vttered by Bel, concerning this matter. 1. *That the Pope burneth*

pag. 111. Theodoret. lib. 5. de Grec. affection. *Bel p.* 106. *vntruth* 88 Vid. Indic. librór. prohibit.

neth Scriptures in vulgar tongue. This is not ſo: For he burneth only heretical tranſlations, and al England knoweth, how currant the Rhemiſts teſtament is amongſt Catholiques. 2. *That the Pope excommunicateth al lay men, that reaſon of matter of faith, or diſpute of his power.* & citeth 6. decret. lib. 5. cap. *Quicunque.* Here be two vntruths. For nether is there any worde of reaſoning of the Popes power, but only of diſputing of the Catholique faith; without touching whereof, we may reaſon of the Popes power in diuers waies, as is shewed art. 1. cap. 1. Nether forbiddeth he lay men to reaſon, or diſpute of faith with whom-ſoeuer, or in what caſe ſoeuer, but only with Heretiks (as is euident out of the whole chapter, which inſtructeth Catholiques, how they ought to behaue them ſelfs towards Heretiks) and when Cleargy men may diſpute, as when that Canon was made they might in al Chriſtendome. And in this caſe it is vnlawful for lay men to diſpute of faith, both becauſe generally they are not ſufficiently learned to defend the faith againſt Heretiks, as alſo becauſe diſputing of faith is proper them, to whome preaching belongeth, who are not lay but Cleargy men. Whereupon ſaid S. Gregory Nazianz. *It is not euery ones part to diſpute of God. This is not ſo baſe*

vntruth 89

vntruth 90

At what tyme lay men are forbidden to diſpute of faith.

S. Greg. Nazianz. orat. 1. de Theol. in Apologet. & orat. Quod non liceat ſemper & publice de Deo conſtdere.

base matter, or pertaining to them, who as yet creeping on the ground, are busyed with earthly study. Euery one may thinke of God, but not dispute of God. Thus S. Gregory for his great knowledge surnamed the Deuine, whose counsel I suppose euery wise man wil sooner follow then Babling Bel. And the ciuil law punisheth al lay men, that publikly dispute of faith. Cod. de Sum. Trin. 3. *That Priests oftentymes vnderstand not the latin words of absolution.* This he might better obiect to his fellow ministers, made ofentymes of coblers, tinkers, and taylers, who may thanke the Lord (as one of them did) that they know nothing of the Romish tongue. vntruth 91 *See Bels lacke of latin art 5. c. 4. paragr. 10. & art. 2. c. 4. parag. 13. and art. 7. c. 9. parag. 19.* 4. *That in the Churches we read vnto the common people latin sermons.* In deed we read such in our seruice, but read them to the common people no more, then we read the Masse to them. But read both in honour, and seruice to God, who vnderstandeth as wel latin as english. And thus much touching Scripture: now let vs come to Traditions. vntruth 92

Chap. IX.

Of Apostolical Traditions whether there be any or none.

OF the Traditions which the Church manteineth, some were instituted by Christ,

Christ, some by his Apostles by the inspiration of the holy Ghost, and others by the Church it selfe. The question is whether there by any of the two former kinds of Traditions instituted, or deliuered by the Apostles, and therupon called Apostolical without writing, *which concerne things* (as Bel saith in the beginning of this article pag. 86.) *necessary to mans saluation*. For though (as I said before) the Scripture conteine al things, which are necessary to be knowne actually of euery one, yet because euery one is bound to deny no point of christian faith, but at lest vertually, and implicitly to beleeue al, such traditions, as concerne matters of faith, or manners, may (as Bel speaketh) be said to concerne things necessary to mans saluation. This supposed, I affirme with the vniforme consent of al holy Fathers, that there are such traditions, and it followeth of that which we proued in the first chapter, that the Scripture conteineth not actually al points of christian faith, and otherwise I proue it: because S. Paul 2. Thess. 2. v. 15. saith *Hold the Traditions which you haue learned, whether it be by worde, or by our epistle*, therfore he deliuered some Traditions only by worde as S. Basil. S. Chrisostom. S. Epiphanius S. Damascen out of this place do gather.

what kind of traditiõs Bel impugneth.

Chapt. 1.

S. Paul.
S. Basil. de Spirit. c. 19.
S. Chrysost. 2. Thessalon. hom. 4.
S. Epiphan. hær. 61.
S. Damascenus 4. de fid. c. 17.

2. Se-

2. Secondly S. Ihon the laſt writer of Scripture ſaid. *Hauing many things to vvrite to you, I vvould not by paper, and inke.* Ergo many things which were to be told to chriſtians, S. Ihon left vnwritten, yea thought it not expedient to write them. Bel anſwereth *That the Apoſtles taught no needful doctrin, which they did not after commit to vvriting.* This anſwer inſinuateth, that the Apoſtles taught ſome needles matter, contrary to S. Paul 2. Timoth. 2, Tit. 3. and that, which S. Paul commanded the Theſſalonicenſes to hold, & S. Ihon ſaid he had to write, were needles things, which is but to blaſpheme the Apoſtles. Thirdly in the law of nature there were traditions as is euident, and teſtifyed Gen 18. v. 19. Likewiſe in tyme of the law written as English Proteſtants confeſſe: why not therefore in tyme of the Ghoſpel?

3. Iohan. 3. 13.

Bel p. 117.

Conference at Hampton Court. p. 68.

3. Fourthly I wil propoſe to the Reader a choiſe ſomwhat like to that which a Roman made to his Citizens, when being accuſed of his aduerſary in a long oration, he ſtept vp and ſaid, my aduerſary affirmeth & I deny it, whether beleeue you citizens. And ſo in few words reiected his aduerſaries long accuſation. For S. Dioniſius Areopag. S. Ignatius, both ſchollers of the Apoſtles, S. Ireney, S. Cyprian, S. Baſil. S. Chri-

Valer. Max. lib. 3. c. 319. de ſcauro & vario ſeuero,
S. Dioniſ. l. 1. eccleſ. hier. c. 1.
S. Ignat. ep. ad Heron.
S. Iren. lib. 3. c. 3.
S. Ciprian. l. 2. epiſt. 3.
S. Baſil. lib. de Spirit. c. 27. 29.

S. Chryſoſt. 2. Theſſal. hom. 4. S. Epiphan. hær. 61. S. Hierom. dial. contr. Lucif. S. Auguſtin. epiſt 118. & l. 10. de Genen. ad lit. c. 23.

Chriſoſtom S. Epiphanius S. Hierom. S. Auſtin and others affirme, that there are Apoſtolical Traditions: Bel & ſome few new ſtart vp Heretiks deny it. Whether beleeue you Chriſtians? This choiſe is far aboue that of the Roman. For there was but one againſt one, yea ones bare denyal againſt the others proofs. But here are many againſt few: Saints againſt (to ſay the leſt) ordinary fellows: Doctors of Gods Church, againſt vnlearned Miniſters: Catholiques againſt Heretiks: yea manifeſt proofs againſt bare denyals. And shal we not eſpecially in a matter of fact (as is whether the Apoſtles left any vnwritten Traditions or no) beleeue many, moſt holy, moſt learned, moſt incorrupt, moſt antient witneſſes, yea wherof ſome were eye witneſſes of the matter, before a few, vnlearned, vnconſtant, iangling, new fellowes?

S. Hierom. epiſt 61. c. 9. S. Auguſtin. de Symbolo ad Catechumen. Ruffin. in Symbol. S. Hierom. con. Heluid. S. Auguſtin hær. 55. S. Epiphan. hær. 78. Locis ſupra cit. & c. 5.

4. Moreouer whence haue we the Apoſtles Creed, but by Tradition, as teſtify S. Hierom, S. Auſtin, and Ruffinus: whence the perpetual virginity of our B. Lady, as appeareth by S. Hierom, S. Auſtin, S. Epiphanius: whence the lawful transferring the Sabbath day from Saterday to Sonday, but by Tradition. Whence many other things, as teſtify S. Hierom S. Dioniſ. S. Iren. S. Cyprian, Tertull. Origen, S. Baſil S. Epiphan.

Epiphan, S. Chriſoſt, S. Hierom, S. Auſtin, S. Ambroſe, and others, but by Tradition. But eſpecially, whence haue we the Bible it ſelfe? Whence haue we that euery booke chapter, and verſe of it is Gods worde, and no one ſentence therin corrupted in al theſe 1600. years? where haue we that the Goſpel bearing the name of S. Thomas, who was an Apoſtle, and eye witnes of Chriſts actions, is not as wel, or better Chriſts Ghoſpel, then that which carrieth the name of S. Luke, and was written only by heare-ſay as is profeſſed in the very beginning, but by Tradition? This reaſon ſo courſeth Bel vp and downe, as like fox many tymes vnearthed, euen for wearines he runneth into the hunters toyle, graunting what the argument would.

Luc. 1. v. 1. S. Hierom. de Scriptur. eccleſ. in Luca.

Bel bringeth ſix anſwers.

5. His firſt anſwer is *That there is great difference betvvixt the primatiue Church, and the Church of late daies. For the Apoſtles heard Chriſts doctrine, ſavv his myracles, and were replenished vvith the holy Ghoſt, and conſequently muſt needs be fit vvitneſſes of al that Chriſt did, and taught, vvhich adiuncts the Church of Rome hath not.* Here Bel blaſphemeth Chriſts Church of late daies, auouching her to be nether replenished with the holy Ghoſt, contrary to our Creed, profeſſing her to be holy, and Chriſts promiſe, *that the holy Ghoſt should*

Bel p. 134.

Symbol. Apoſtol.

Ioan. 14.7. 16. should remaine with her for euer. Nor to be a fit witnes of his truth, contrary to S. Paul,

1.Timoth.3. 7.15. affirming her to be *the piller, and strength of truth*; and to Gods, sending her to preach, and testify his truth to infidels, to whom if she be no fit witnes, the fault is in God to send such insufficient witnesses, as infidels are not bound to beleeue.

What maketh sufficient witnesses of Gods truth.

6. And Bel is far deceaued in thinking, that seeing, or hearing make men sufficient witnesses of deuine, and infallible truth, or the want of them maketh insufficient. For not humane sense, which is subiect to error, and deceit, but Gods deuine assistance, maketh men infallible, and sufficient witnesses of his truth, and the want of this, insufficient. Wherfore S. Mathew was as sufficient a witnes of Christs natiuity, which he saw not, as of other things he saw, and S. Luke as sufficient a witnes of the things he wrote by hear-say, as S. Ihon who saw, and heard almost al he wrote because they were equally assisted by God in their writing. And in like sort the Church of what tyme soeuer is equally a sufficient, and infallible witnes of Christs truth, though she be not an eye, or eare witnes of his speeches, and

Math. 28. 7. 20. Ioan. 14. Math. 16. actions, as the primatiue Church was. Because Christs promises of his presence, and the holy Ghosts assistance, and that the gates

gates of Hel should not preuaile against her, appertaine equally to the Church of al tymes:

7. But suppose that the present Church could not be a fit witnes as the primatiue was, what is this to the argument, that proueth necessity of Tradition, because without testimony of the Church, we can not discerne true Scripture from false. This Bel should ether graunt, or deny, if he meant to answer to the purpose, and not tel vs of an other matter, vz. That the present Church can be no fit witnes, whereof (if it were true) wold follow, that we can beleeue no Scripture at al, seeing we haue no other infallible external witnes of Scripture. *Bel answereth not to the purpose.*

8. His second answer is: *That as Papists admit the Iewes Tradition of the old Testament, to be Gods word, and withal refuse many other Traditions of theirs: So Protestants admit this Tradition* (of the Bible to be Gods worde) *and reiect al other.* And pag. 128. He dareth not deny Traditions absolutly, yea admitteth them, when they be consonant to Scripture. Behold the silly fox in the toyle. We contend against Protestants, That Scripture is not sufficient to proue al points of Christian faith, but that Tradition is necessary for some, and Bel here confesseth it, where *Bel p. 134.* *Bel admitteth tradition.*

XUM

where is now the *downefal of Popery*? Me thinks. it is become the down-fal of Proteſtantry. Where is now Bels firſt propoſition? *That Scripture conteineth in it euery doctrine neceſſary to mans ſaluation.* Where is now that *We muſt not adde to Gods written Worde*, if this Tradition muſt needs be added therto? where is now, that *the preſent Church can be no fit Witnes*, if by her teſtimony, we come to know Gods truth? Where is *now the curſe, Which S. Paul* (as thou ſaiſt pag. 117.) *pronounceth againſt him, that preacheth any doctrine not conteined in Scripture*? where is now. *That Scripture is the ſole, and only rule of faith?*

pag. 86. & 88.

pag. 87.

pag. 134.

Bel curſed of S. Paul by his owne iudgement.

pag. 118.

9. But ſeeing the fox is in the toyle, we muſt needs haue him preach, and tel vs of whome he firſt had this Tradition. Perhaps he wil confeſſe with his brother Doue, that Proteſtants had the Bible as Gods worde from Papiſts. Sure I am, he can name no other of whome he firſt had it. Likewiſe he muſt tel vs. How he beleeueth this Tradition. Whether as fallible and humane truth, or as infallible and deuine. If as fallible, and humane, ſurely he can beleeue nothing in the Bible as deuine truth. If as infallible, and deuine truth, ſurely the Papiſts Church for whoſe only teſtimony (ſpeaking of outward teſtimonies) Proteſtants firſt beleeue: as an infallible truth that the Bible

Doue of Reuſancy. pag. 13.

Bible was Gods worde) hath infallible authority.

10. Nether is Bels compariſon true. For we beleeue not the old teſtamẽt to be Gods worde, for any Tradition, which the Iewes haue, but which the Catholique Church hath from the Apoſtles, & their ſucceſſors, *euen* (as S. Auſtin writeth) *from the very ſeat of Peter, to whom our Lord commanded his ſheepe to feed, to this preſent Bishop*, who deliuered vnto the Church, and she to vs, as wel the olde as the new teſtament for Gods worde. Let Bel if he liſt beleeue the old teſtament, for the tradition of Iewes, and if he can not finde the like vninterrupted tradition for the new teſtament, but in the Papiſts Church, let him confeſſe, that for her authoriry he beleeueth this tradition as infallible truth, and I aske no more. Cont. epiſt. fundam. c. 4. to. 6.

11. But what ſhift findeth he for this notorious contradiction, in admitting one tradition, and before impugning traditions in general. Forſooth becauſe as he ſaith (and it is his fourth ſolution) *When Proteſtants ſay Scripturs conteine al things neceſſary to ſaluation, they ſpeake of Scripturs already agreed vpon to be ſuch, and ſo exclude not this tradition, but vertually include it in their aſſertion*: Behold the fox againe in the toile, admitting one tradition ful ſore againſt his wil. *O violence* Bel p. 135. Proteſtants admit tradition.

of truth (saith S. Austin l. cont. Donatist. post Collat. c. 24. *stronger then any racke, or torment for to wring out confession.* For here Bel in name of Protestants confesseth, that they must needs admit one tradition, which not only ouerthroweth al their arguments against other traditions, For why may they adde one tradition to Gods written worde, rather then more? why may they beleeue any thing out of Scripture, and no more? why is one tradition equal to Gods written worde, and no more? How is one tradition certaine and no more: But also sheweth that ether they receaue this tradition for no authority at al, but only becausse it pleaseth them, or that they beleeue it as infallible verity, for the authority which they account but fallible. For I aske why they beleeue this tradition? If they answer, becausse it commeth from God. I demand how they know that? Not by the Bible as is euident. If by the Church; then I aske why they beleeue the Church, rather in this tradition, then in other, and whether they beleeue her testimony to be infallible in this point or no: And whatsoeuer they answer, they must needs fal into the toile.

Protestants ouerthrow their owne argumnts against traditions.

Bel p. 135. 12. His third solution is. *That the new Testament is but an exposition of the olde, and therfore may be tryed and discerned by the same.*

But

But Syr? wil you indeed try the new testament? wil you take vpon you to iudge Gods worde? Surely this pride exceedeth Lucifers, this is to make your selfe iudge aboue the highest. And if you wil try Gods word, by what wil you try the old testament? Surely by tradition, or by nothing. Thus we haue heard Bel twise plainly cõfessing some tradition to be necessary, & now the third tyme supposing it. For *magna est vis veritatis & præualet.* *Bel vvil examin Scriptures.*

13. Yet because his stomacke could not disgest any one tradition at al, he flyeth to a Fift solution, commonly giuen by Protestants. vz *That Canonical Scripture may be discerned from not Canonical by themselues, as light is from darknes.* This he proueth *because Gods worde is called a light, and a lantherne, sayd to shyne to men. spiritual men sayd to iudge al things, the vnction to teach al things, and Christs sheepe sayd to heare, and know his voyce.* But this is easely refelled. First because though Samuel were a faithful, & holy man, and God spake thrise to him, yet he tooke his worde for mans worde, vntil Hely the high Priest tolde him it was Gods worde 1. Reg. 3. Gedeon was faithful, and yet knew not at first that it was God that spake vnto him by an Angel, and therfore demanded a miracle in confirmation of it Iudic. 6. The like may

pag 135 al. 117.

Psalm. 119. v. 105.
1. Pet. 1. v. 19.
2. Cor. 5. v. 3.
1. Cor. 2. v. 15.
1. Ioan. 2. v. 27.
Ioan. 10 v. 3 4.
1. Reg. 3.

Iudic. 6.

be said of Manues wife Iud. 13. and perhaps of Manue himselfe. For though in his prayer he professe that God had sent the Angel, whom he tooke to be a man, yet doth he not professe that God had sent him especially, and perticulerly to do that message, and seeing he knew not, that it was an Angel, vntil he ascended in the flame of the sacrifice, yea seemed to doubt whether his words would proue true, when he sayd. *If thy speech be fulfilled*, likely it is that he was not certaine that it was Gods worde, before he was certaine, that it was his Angel. Likewise S. Peter was faithful, and yet at first he knew not, that it was an Angel that spake, and deliuered him act. 12.

Act. 12.

14. Secondly the true sense, and meaning of Gods worde, is not so euident to the faithful, for to discerne it from the false sense, as light is discerned from darknes. Ergo, nether Gods true worde is so euidently discerned by them from the false worde. The consequence I proue, because Gods worde consisteth more in his meaning then in letters. *Let vs not thincke* (saith S. Hierom) *that the Ghospel is in the words of Scripturs, but in the sence.* Againe: *Scripturs consist not in reading but in vnderstading.* And therfore if it be discerned by it selfe, it is rather discerned by the sense, then by the letters or words.

S. Hierom. in Calat. 1. & dialog. con. Lucif.

The

The antecedent I shal proue hereafter, and it is euident by the example of the Apostles, who though they were faithful oftentymes vnderstood not Christs meaning, especially when he spake in parables, or of his passion by the example of the faithful Eunuch, and by the testimony of S. Peter 2. Pet. 3. v. 16.

15. Thirdly the distinction of Scripturs from not Scriptures, is not so euident, as the distinction of light from darknes is. Ergo, they are not so easely discerned. The consequence is euident. The Antecedent I proue, becaus then no man could erre in it, as none can erre in the distinction of light from darknes. Bel saith. *That only faithful can discerne Scriptures.* But this conuinceth that their distinction is not so euident as that of light from darknes: for this al men, yea beasts of sight can discerne. Nether can faith be needful to discerne light, or any thing which is so euident, becaus as S. Paul saith Hebr. 11. v. 1. *It is an argument of things not appearing*, and it breadeth certainty, not euidency in the beleeuer.

Faith can not discerne any thing clearly.

16. Beside if faithful could as clearly discerne Scriptures, as they can light, they should no sooner here a sentence of Scripture, then they should discerne it to be Scripture, as they no sooner see light, then

they diſcerne it from darknes, which experience teacheth to be falſe: yea Luther a faithful man (in Bels opinion) could not diſcerne, yea could not beleeue S. Iames epiſtle to be canonical, but called it abſolutly a ſtrawish thing, as his books firſt printed, and diuers others teſtify, and Whitaker dare not deny, yea confeſſeth that he calleth *it ſtrawish in reſpect of other epiſtles*, which is more then to deny it to be Gods worde. Wherfore let Bel make his choyſe, whether Luther was not faithful, or S. Iames epiſtle not ſo euidently diſcerned by the faithful to be Gods worde as light is. Finally Proteſtants admit one Tradition, as neceſſary to diſcerne Scriptures, or Bel lyeth pag. 135. Ergo: Scriptures are not ſo euidently diſcerned by them ſelues as light is. For what neede is there of an other thing to diſcerne light, or any thing ſo euident.

Luther. edit. Ienen. Surius Ann. 1522. VVhitaker. lib. 1. contr. Duræum p. 22.

17. Nether haue Bels arguments any difficulty to anſwer. For Gods worde is called a lantherne, or light, not becauſe it is ſo euident, as light is; but becauſe, being once beleeued to be Gods worde, it sheweth vs the way to heauen, as light doth to earthly places, and thereupon it is called of the Pſalmiſt a *lantherne to our feete*. And for the ſame cauſe faith is called light, though it be an obſcure knowledge. Hebr. 11. v. 1. and by it

Pſalm. 118.

by it we ſee God only *in ænigmate*: 1. Cor. 13. v. 12 and not clearly. And in like ſort S. Paul 2. Corinth. 4. v. 4. (where Bel citeth amiſſ. c. 5.) ſaith the Ghoſpel shineth, not becauſe it is euident, and cleare, but becauſe it expelleth the ignorance of infidelity, which metaphorically is called darknes. That of the ſpiritual man 1. Corinth. 2. v. 15. is nothing to the purpoſe, both becauſe al faithful are not ſpiritual, but ſome carnal 1. Corinth. 3. v. 1. 2. 3. and Galath. 6. v. 1. and therfore may we better infer that the Ghoſpel is not euident to al faithful: As alſo becauſe S. Paul explicateth, not by what means the ſpiritual man iudgeth al things, whether by the euidency of the things (as Bel wold haue him to iudge Scripture) or by ſome outward teſtimony. Moreouer S. Ihon ſaith the vnction teacheth vs al things, which we deny not, but no where, that it alone teacheth vs without the teſtimony of the Church, which is that we deny, & Bel should proue. Finally Chriſts sheep heare, and know his voice Ioan. 10. v. 3 4 which no man doubteth of, but the queſtion is whether they heare it of him ſelfe alone, or of the Church, and whether they know it by it ſelfe, or by teſtimony of the Church, to which purpoſe this place ſerueth nothing.

2. Corinth. 4. v. 4.

3. Ioan. 2. v. 27.

Ioan. 10. v. 3, 4.

Bel p. 136. 18. Bels sixt solution is, *That we beleeue not the Scripture to be Gods worde, because the Church teacheth vs so, but because it is of it selfe axiopistos worthy of credit, and God inwardly moueth vs to beleeue it.* That we beleeue it not for the Churches authority he proueth. Because els the formal obiect of our beleefe, and last resolution therein, should not be the first verity, God him selfe, but man, which is contrary to S. Dionis. and S. Thomas Aquinas, who teach. That the formal obiect of our faith is the first verity, and S. Thom. addeth, That faith beleeueth nothing, but because it is reuealed of God: Also because *S. Austin saith, That man learneth not of man, that outward teachings are some helps, and admonitions, but who teacheth the hart hath his chayre in heauen.* That the Scripture is of it selfe *axiopistos*, or worthy of credit, we deny not, only we deny, that by it selfe without testimony of the Church, we can knowe that it is so worthy. Nether deny we, that God inwardly moueth our harts to beleeue it, only we say that therto he vseth also the testimony of the holy Church, nor ordinarily moueth any therto, without the external testimony of the Church. wherfore albeit it be most true that we beleeue the Scripture to be Gods worde, because God moueth vs therto: yet

S. Dionis. de diuin. nom. c. 7.

S. Thom. 2. 2. q. 1. art. 1.

S. Augustin. tractat. 3. in Ioan. to. 9.

false

falſe it is to deny, that we beleeue it not alſo, becauſe the Church doth teach it. Becauſe Gods inward motion, and the Churches outward teſtimony, are no oppoſit cauſes, and impoſſible to concurre to one, and the ſame effect; but the ſecond is ſubordinate to the firſt, and can not worke without it, as the firſt (though it can) doth not worke this effect without the ſecond. Wherfore wel ſaid S. Auſtin *Non crederem Euangelio niſi me Eccleſiæ auctoritas commoueret.* I wold not beleeue the Ghoſpel, vnles the authority of the Church did commoue me therto. Cont. epiſt. fundam. c. 4. to. 6.

19. This place of S. Auſtin ſo ſtingeth Bel, as he wyndeth euery way to auoid it. Firſt he telleth vs *that there is a great difference betweene mouere and commouere: becauſe mouere is to moue apart by it ſelfe, commouere to moue together with an other.* This difference is falſe. For neither is *mouere* to moue apart, but abſolutly, as it is cõmon to mouing apart, or with an other. Neither, though *commouere* do more properly ſignify moũing with an other, is it alwaies ſo taken, as infinit places both of holy and prophane writers can teſtify: yea Bel him ſelfe with in 8. lynes after englisheth it abſolutly *mouing*. But ſuppoſe it were: what inferreth Bel thereupon. Forſooth *that S. Auſtins meaning is nothing els, but that the authority of the Church did* pag. 137. Bels lacke of Latin. pag. 138.

out-

outwardly concurre with the inward motion of God, to bring him to beleeue the Ghoſpel. That the Church did ioyntly concurre to S. Auſtins faith of the Ghoſpel is certaine, and ſo Bel tranſlating *commouere* for iointly mouing I refuſe not. But falſe it is that the Church did iointly concurre with God, only to the bringing of S. Auſtin to the faith of the Ghoſpel, and not to the conſerning him in the ſame faith. Becauſe c. 4. he ſaith, *That if thou percaſe canſt finde any manifeſt thing in the Ghoſpel of Maniches Apoſtleship, thou ſhalt weaken the authority of Catholiques with me, who bid me beleeue not thee, which authority being weakned, now nether can I beleeue the Ghoſpel.* Behold the authority of Catholiques conſerued S. Auſtin in the faith of the Ghoſpel, without which he profeſſeth that he could beleeue the Ghoſpel no longer. And againe. Amongſt other things, which moſt iuſtly as he ſaith holde him in the Church he reckoneth authority, and ſucceſſion in the Church.

§. Auſtin.

20. But do you thinke that Bel wil ſtand to his expounding of *commouere*, and graunting the Church to concurre with the inward motion of the holy Ghoſt to bring a man to beleeue the Ghoſpel? No ſurely: For in the next page he telleth vs. *That the authority of the Church, did moue* (beholde iointly

pag. 138.

iointly mouing forgotten) *S. Auſtin to heare the Ghoſpel preached, and to giue ſome humane credit vnto it. For deuine faith proceedeth not from the outward teachings of man, as I haue proued* (ſaith he) *already out of S. Auſtin.* This denyal of deuine faith to proceed from outward teaching of man, is directly againſt Scripture, and S. Auſtin. For Rom. 10. v. 17. *Faith commeth of hearing* (the preacher.) The Coloſſians learnt the grace of Chriſt of Epaphoras. Coloſſ. 1. v. 7. The Theſſalonians learnt the Traditions, which they ſhould keep by ſpeech and letter: 2. Theſſ. 2. v 15 S. Paul begate the Corinthians in the Ghoſpel. 1. Corinth. 4. v. 15. He begate Oneſimus: Philem. v. 11. He and Apollo were Gods helpers in bringing the Corinthians to Chriſts faith. 1. Corinth. 3. v. 9. They that ſuccour preachers are called *cooperators of the truth* 3. Ioan. v. 8. and therfore much more the preachers them ſelfs And if deuine faith proceede not at al from outwarde teaching of men, why did Chriſt ſend his Apoſtles to *teach al nations*? Math. 28. v. 19. why appointed he in his Church *ſome teachers for conſummating of ſaints* Epheſ. 4. v. 11, Why was S Paul a *teacher of Gentils*? 1. Timoth. 2. v. 7. others? act. 13 v. 4 How could S. Paul *beſtovv ſome ſpiritual grace vpon the Romans*. Rom. 1. v. 11. Did Chriſt ſend

S. Paul. Roman. 10.
Coloſſ. 2.
2. Theſſalon. 2.
1. Corinth. 4.
Philemon.
3. Ioan. 8.
Math. 28.
Epheſ. 4.
2. Timoth. 1.
Act. 13.

theſe

Rom. 1. these Apostles to teach humaine faith? was S. Ihon Baptist sent before Christ to giue humane knowledge of saluation to his people? Luc. 1. v. 77. Lastly nothing is more frequent in Scripture then that one man teacheth an other, and surely it meaneth not of humane learning, or beleefe. For what careth the Scripture for that, but of deuine, and such as bringeth to heauen & saluation, such as made Iewes compunct in hart. act. 2. v. 37. such as disposed Gentils to receaue the holy Ghost. act. 10. v. 44.

Luc. 1.

Act. 2. & 10.

21. Likewise it is against S. Austin: First he thinketh (as Bel confesseth) the Church to concurre, with the inward motion of the holy Ghost to the faith of the Ghospel: But faith of the Ghospel, to which the holy Ghost inwardly concurreth is deuine. Ergo to this the Church concurreth: Besids S. Austin affirmeth, that authority holdeth him in the Catholique Church. And that if the authority of Catholiques were weakned, he wold not beleeue the Ghospel, which he would neuer say, if his deuine faith did not depend vpon the Catholiques authority. Moreouer what more euident then the holy Fathers, when they speake of beleeuing the Ghospel, they meane of deuine, and Christian faith. And what faith should S. Austin meane of, but of such faith as he

Cont. epist. fundam. c. 4. num. 6.

as he exhorted the Maniches vnto, which was deuine. And in the place alleadged by Bel, he calleth outward teaching helpe to faith, and only meaneth, that a man can not learne faith of man alone, without al inward teaching of God. And therfore addeth. That *if he be not within, who teacheth the heart, in vayne is our sound, and where Gods inspiration is not, there in vaine words sound outwardly.* which is moſt true, and nothing againſt vs. Laſtly it is againſt reaſon. For the authority of Gods Church is not meere humane, but in ſome ſort deuine, as a witnes by God him ſelfe appointed to teſtify his truth. And therfore he ſaid, *Who heareth you heareth me:* therfore the faith that proceedeth from ſuch authority is not humane. Tract. 3. in 1 Ioan. to. 9. Luc. 10. 16.

22. Wherfore Bel not truſting much to this ſhift flyeth to an other: vz. *That S. Auſtin ſaid not theſe words of him ſelfe, as he was then a chriſtian, but as he had bene in tymes paſt a Maniche.* This he proueth: Becauſe in the ſame chapter he ſaith. *That the authority of the Ghoſpel is aboue the authority of the Churche,* & in the chapter before. *That the truth of Scriptures muſt be preferred before authority, conſent of nations, and the name of Catholique, and promiſeth to yeeld to Maniches doctrine, if he ſhal be able to proue it out of Scripture.* But both this vntruth 93 1. vntruth 94 2. vntruth 95 3.

anſwer,

anſwer, and proofs are moſt faiſly auouched vpon S Auſtin. For if he had meant the foreſaid words of him ſelfe only, as when he was a Manichiſt, he wold not haue ſaid, *Non crederem niſi commoueret* &c. I wold not beleeue, vnles the Church did commoue me: *But non credidiſſem, niſi commoniſſet*: I had not or wold not haue beleeued, vnleſſe the Church had commoued me. Which Bel wel marking, made him ſay ſo in english, though he had not ſaid it in latine. Beſides in the ſame chapter he addeth. *Qua (authoritate Catholicorum) infirmata iam nec potero Euangelio credere.* which (authority of Catholiques) being diſcredited, I ſhal not be able now (marke Bel) to beleeue the Ghoſpel. Moreouer cap. 4. he ſaid, *That beſides other motiues, the authority of Catholiques* (tenet) *doth holde me in the lap of the Church.*

Falſe tranſlat. 12.

23. Bels proofs are nothing but his owne vntruths. For though it be true That the Scripture is of greater authority then the Church, yet nether doth S. Auſtin ſay it in that place, nether maketh it any thing againſt vs. For albeit the Scriptrurs be in it ſelfe of greater authority, yet the authority of the Church is both infallible, and more euident to me. And what maruel if for an infallible authority more euident, I beleeue an other though greater, yet not ſo manifeſt.

feſt. As S. Ihon was ſent to giue teſtimony of Chriſt Ioan. 1 v. 8. and yet far inferior to Chriſt. Nether ſaith S. Auſtin. That truth of Scripture is to be preferred before the authority and conſent of Catholiques. But Bel added the worde *Scripturs* as though S. Auſtin meant, that their truth could be knowne, without the authority of Catholiques, or be oppoſit vnto it, which he manifeſtly denyeth. Nether meaneth he of the truth of Scripturs (which the Manichiſt againſt whom he wrote reiected almoſt wholy, and he him ſelfe profeſſeth he could not take for truth, if it were contrary to Catholiques) but of any knowne truth in general, which he ſaith (and truly) is to be preferred before al authority oppoſit vnto it, becauſe ſuch authority is not infallible, but falſe, and deceitful. And therfore he ſpeaketh vppon ſuppoſition, that if it were true (which other where he auoucheth to be impoſſible) that Manichiſts taught truth, and Catholiques error, *then their truth vvere to be preferred before the name of Catholiques, conſent of nations, and authority begun with miracles, nourished vvith hope, encreaſed vvith charity, eſtablished vvith antiquity, and ſucceßion of Prieſts, euen from the ſeat of Peter, to vvhom our Lord after his reſurrection commanded his sheep to be fed vnto this preſent Bishop.* But ſaith the glorious Saint

S. Auſtin ſpeaketh of moſt manifeſt and euident truth and ſuch is not the Scriptures.

Saint vnto maniches, & I after him to Protestants. *Amongst you only soundeth the promise of truth, vvhich if it vvere so manifest, as it could not be doubted of, it vvere to be preferred before al things, that hold me in the Catholique Church.*

24. His third vntruth of S. Austins promise, is directly contrary to S. Austin in the same place. *If* (saith he) *thou shalt read any manifest thing for Manichey* out of the G. ospel, *I vvil beleeue neither them nor thee. Not them because they lyed to me of thee. Not thee, because thou bringest me that Scripture, vvhich I beleeued through them vvho haue lyed:* As for Bels reasons to proue, that we beleeue nothing with deuine faith for authority of the Church, they are easely answered. For though the formal obiect of faith be the first verity, yet not simply as it is in it selfe, but as it is proposed vnto vs by the Church. And therfore though we beleeue nothing, but because it is spoken, and reuealed by God, yet because he speaketh not immediatly to vs by him selfe, but by the mouth of his Church, whome who so heareth, heareth God, and whose worde is *not mans worde, but truly Gods worde*. therfore faith is not without the testimony of the Church. As for S. Austins authority it hath bene answered before: as also his arguments. which Bel bringeth against Traditions.

S. Austin vvold not beleeue Manichey though he had manifest Scripture. Sup. paragr. 18.

Luc. 10. 7. 16. 1. Thess. c. 2. 7. 13.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of the certainty of Apoſtolical Traditions.

THERE are certaine and vndoubted Apoſtolical traditions. This is againſt Bel pag. 128 129. &c. But I proue it, becauſe the traditions of the Byble to be Gods worde, of the perpetual virginity of our B. Lady, of the transferring of the Sabbath, and ſuch like, are certaine and vndoubted. Beſids if in the law of nature, and Moyſes, traditions were keapt certaine, why not in the law of grace. But more euident wil the concluſion be, if we deſcend to perticuler traditions, which Bel endeuoreth to proue vncertaine. Firſt he ſetteth downe this Propoſition. *Vnwritten traditions are ſo vncertaine as the beſt learned papiſts are at great contẽtion about them.* This he proueth in the tradition of Eaſter, about which contended *S. Victor P. & the Biſhops of Aſia about 1400 years agoe both earneſtly alleadging Apoſtolical traditions. Likewiſe S. Anicetus, and S. Policarpe who liued al within 200. years after Chriſt, when the Church was in good eſtate, and ſtayned with fewe, or no corruptions.* *Bel p. 128. 129.*

1. Marke good Reader his concluſion, and proofs therof, and thou wilt neede no

more to assure thy selfe of the truth of Romane religion: His conclusion is: That traditions are so vncertaine as the learnedest Papists contend about them. This he proueth: because S. Victor P. contended with the Bishops of Asia, S. Policarpe with S. Anicetus P. Surely he meaneth that these men were Papists, or els his conclusion is vnproued. And consequently Papists, and Popery were 1400. years agoe within 200. years after Christ, when the Church (as he saith) was in good estate. And if P. Victor were a Papist, then was also his immediat predecessor S. Eleutherius, who sent S. Fugatius and Damian to conuert Britany, and consequently this Iland was first conuerted from Paganisme to Popery. Moreouer both sides earnestly alleadged Apostolical tradition, and stowtly defended the same saith Bel, Ergo: nether side was Protestant, and both agreed against him, that there are Apostolical traditiōs, & that they are of great weight, seeing such great Saints so long agoe did so stowtly defend them, on what side now is Bel, who stowtly oppugneth, what Saints with al Gods Church so long agoe defended? what need more proofe of traditions or of Papistry? Surely Bel *quasi sorex suo iudicio periit.* Here he hath bewraied him selfe to be against al Saints, that were within

Popery confessed to be vvish in 200. years after Christ.

Great Britany conuerted first to Popery.

Bel against al Gods Church vvhich liued vvithin 200. years after Christ.

within 200. years after Christ, and against the Church, when she was in good estate.

3. But now to Bels argument. The tradition of keeping Easter was vncertaine 200 years after Christ. Ergo it is now. Answer. This tradition was then vncertaine only in Asia, and certaine in the rest of Christendome, as is euident by the Councels then holde in Rome, Palestine, Pontus, France, Achaia, who al accepted this tradition, as did after the first general Councel in Nice. And though it had bene then vncertaine, Bel could no more infer it to be so now, then he can infer the same of many parts of the Bible, which both then, and long after were doubted of, and yet accepted now of Protestants. But wel may I infer, if S Policarpe and his fellowes erred in not accepting one popish tradition, much more Bel in accepting none.

Euseb. lib. 5. c. 23. 25. & l. 3. de vit. Constan. c. 18. 19. Nicephor. l. 4. c. 36. Theodoret. l. 2. hist. c. 9. Epiphan. hær. 70. Tripart. lib. 9. c. 38. Epist. 2. Petri 2 & 3. Ioan. Epist. Iudæ & ad Hebræos. Apocalipsis. See S. Hierom. in Script. ecclesiasticis. Et Euseb. l. 5. c. 3.

4. *But* (saith Bel) *S. Policarpe Policrates, and other Bishops did in those daies make no more account of the Popes opinion, then of an other mans, did thinke them selfs his equals in gouernment, & that he defended an error, and withstood his proceedings.* Here is false conueiance to ioyne S. Policarp, who liued, and dyed in vnion, and communion of the Pope, and before this controuersy was defyned, with Policrates, and his fellows, who were excom-

pag. 129.

Euseb. lib. 5. c. 24. & Iren. apud ipsum.

Ipſe. cit. municated, *as declining* (ſaith Euſebius) *into hereſy* for their obſtinacy in error, after the whole Church had defyned the contrary. Theſe indeed (as heretiks vſe to do) made no account of the Popes opinion, or iudgement, but condemned him of error, and withſtood his proceedings, though they neuer thought them ſelfs his equals, as Bel without al truth, or proofe affirmeth, yea Polecrates when he ſaith, *I wil not feare them, who threaten me, and I muſt obey God more then men*, sheweth him ſelfe to be vnder the Popes obedience, but ſuppoſing him ſelfe to defend truth, feared not his excommunication. But how much al Chriſtendom at that tyme, and euer ſince made account of the Popes ſentence, appeareth by that (as Euſebius, and others write) they al followed it, and condemned them as Heretiks who withſtood it. And S. Policarp ſo eſteemed it, as that he came to Rome to confer with the Pope about that matter, & doubtles wold haue ſubſcribed to his ſentence, if it had bene pronounced in his daies, as his ſcholler S. Ireney did, by whom we may gather his maiſters account of the Church of Rome. He therfore lib. 3. cap. 3. calleth Rome the *greateſt and antienteſt Church founded by S. Peter, and Paul*, and that *by Tradition which it hath from the Apoſtles, and alwaies*

S. Hierom. de ſcript. eccleſ. in Papia. Nicephor. l. 4. c. 37.

Euſeb. ſup.

Euſeb. lib. 5. cap. 24. & 5. Ireney apud ipſum Nicephor. l. 3. c. 30.

S. Iren.

waies keapeth, by ſucceſſion of Biſhops We confound (ſaith he) *al them that gather otherwiſe then they ſhould*, and that *al Churches muſt recur to Rome for her more potent principality.*

5. The ſecond Tradition is that of keeping lent *Which* (ſaith Bel) *is not Apoſtolical*: becauſe S. Chriſoſtom writeth. *That Chriſt bid Vs not imitat his faſt*, but *be humble*: Not certain becauſe *Euſebius out of Ireney* writeth *That in his tyme ſome thought We ought to faſt one day, others two, others more and nonnulli forty, which Variety of faſting began not now firſt, or in our daies, but long before, I thinke by them, Who keeping not ſimply what Was* (*traditum*) *deliuered from the beginning, did afterward fal into an other cuſtome ether of negligence, or of ignorance*. Here Bel sheweth his lacke of iudgement in citing a place clearly againſt him ſelfe. For here S Ireney, and Euſebius after him clearly affirme. That at the beginning there was one manner of faſting lent appointed, though ſome afterward ether of ignorance or negligence did breake it, which proueth not the ſaid Tradition to be vncertain in the whole Church, vnles Bel wil impute the fault of ſome few to the whole. And of the Roman Church, *she* (ſaith Ireney lib. 3. cap. 3.) *alwaies keapt the Apoſtles Tradition*. And by this is anſwered what he bringeth out of Socrates touching

Bel p. 130.

S. Chryſoſt. hom. 47. in Math. to. 2.

Euſeb. lib. 5. c. 24.

S. Ireney.

Ex hiſtor. tripart. lib. 9. c. 38.

the diuersity of tyme, and meat vsed in fasting lent. Albeit what Socrates saith of the Roman Church fasting but three weeks before Easter, and not on Saterday is an vntruth. For they fasted 40. daies, as witnes S. Leo. serm. 12. de Quadrag. and S Gregory hom 16. in Euang. And likewise Saterdaies as testify S. Innocent. epist. ad Decent. and S. Austin epist. 86. and 118. where also he alleadgeth S. Ambrose.

S. Leo.
S. Gregory.
S. Innocent.
S. Augustin.

6. And that lent is an Apostolical Tradition, not only S. Hierom epist. ad Marcel. witnesseth, and S. Ambrose serm. 25. 34. and 36. saith it was cõmanded by Christ: and S Austin hær. 53 accounted the Aërians heretiks for *denying the set fast* (of lent, and others) *to be solemnely kept*. But it is euident also becausse euermore it hath bene obserued, as appeareth by S. Ignatius epistol. ad Philip. S. Ireney loc. cit. Origen. hom. 10. Leuit. Basil. orat. 2. de ieiunio: Chrysostom hom. 1 in Gen. and 11. hom. 16. and 73. ad populum. S. Austin epist. 118. and 119. and serm. de quadrag. Leo and Gregor. loc. cit. And what S. Chrysostom meant in the words cited by Bel, he him self explicateth in these words. *Because I am sorry* (saith he) *if neglecting the rest you thinke fasting sufficient to saue you, which is the meanest of the vertues.* So that he meant that Christ bid vs not only

S. Hierom.
S. Ambros.
6. Augustin.
S. Epiphan. hær. 75.
S. Ignatius.
S. Ireney.
Origen.
S. Basil.
S. Chryso Hom.
S. Augustin.
S. Leo.
S. Gregory.
S. Grego. Nazianzen. in sanct. lauacrum.
Concil. Laodicen. Can. 50.

only fast lent, but more especially be humble, and milde. The like speech vsed Christ when he said: *I will haue mercy, and not sacrifice* vz. only, and rather then mercy. And so we may say with S. Chrysostom he commanded not fasting, but humility. And Bel vseth his old trade in auouching vs to *think it greater sinne to eat flesh in lent, then to commit adultery, murder, or periury*. Whereas euery Catholique knoweth these sinnes to be against the law of nature, and lawful in no case whatsoeuer, and the other against a positiue precept, which according to the general custome of the Church, bindeth none vnder 21. or aboue 60. years old, no sicke body, no laboring man, no woeman bearing, or nursing children, besides many other perticuler cases wherein fasting in lent is dispensed withal. See S. Hierom. ep. ad Celantiam. *Matth.* 9. v. 13. *Ose* c. 6. v. 6. *vntruth* 96 *Bel p.* 130.

7. Eight Traditions more Bel reckoneth as of celebrating in vnleauened bread, of Christs age, when he dyed, of his raigne on earth after iudgement, of Zacharias that was slayne betwixt the Temple, and the altar, of the Popes teaching successiuely the self some doctrin with S. Peter, of our ladies conception without original sinne, of Constantins baptisme at Rome, and lastly of honoring Saints: But these are ether falsly alleadged for traditions. or litle, or *Bel p.* 131. 132. 133.

nothing to the purpose. For that of celebrating in vnleauened bread, concernes no thing necessary to mans saluation, as testify P Leo 9 and P. Eugenius 4. and therfore is none of these which Bel vndertooke in the beginning of this article to impugne. And though S. Ireney were deceaued about Christs age when he suffered, and Papias about his reigne after iudgement, that maketh not much to the purpose. For wel may the Church be certain of Traditions, though one Father were mistaken about one Tradition, and an other about an other. That of Zachary that he was S. Ihon Baptists father who was so slain S. Basil reporteth not as an Apostolical, but an historical Tradition, and though S. Hierom deny it, yet Origen, S. Greg. Nissen, S. Cyril and Valentinian affirme it.

Leo 9. ep. ad Michaelem Patriarchã. c. 29.
Eugen. 4. in decreto Armonis.
These two were no traditions but erroneous opinios.
See S. Hierom. de scriptur. in Padia.
Bel impugneth histories in steed of Traditions.
Origen. in 25. Math.
Basil. homil. de human. Christi. General.
Nissen orat. de Christi. natiu.
Cyrill cont. Anthropo.
This is no Tradition but if it be ment of the Popes teaching as he is Pope it is in Scripture if as a priuat mãs it is an opinion.

8. As for the Popes successiuely teaching the self same doctrin with S. Peter, the trut thereof vntó S Victor P. tyme about the year 187. is testifyed by S. Ireney lib. 3. c. 3. vntil S Cornelius P. about the yeare 251. by S. Cyprian lib. 1. epist 3 vnto S. Lucius 1 P. about 257. by him self epist. ad Episc. Hispan. & Gall. vntil S. Dammasus P. about the year 380 by S. Hierom epist. ad Damas. vntil S Leo 1 Pope about 410 by Theodoret epistol. ad Renatum: vntil S. Gelasius

Gelasius 1. P. about 496. by him self epist. ad Anast. vntil S. Ihon 2. Pope about the year 533. by him self epist. ad Iustin. vntil S. Gregory the great about the year 600. by him self lib. 6 epist 37 vntil Pope Agatho about the yeare 681. by him self in his epistle approued 6. Synod. act 8. and 18. vntil P. Nicolas about the year 860. by him self epist ad Michael. Imperat vntil P. Leo 9 about the yeare 1050. by him self epistol. ad Petr. Antioch. vntil Pope Innocent. 2. about the year 1140. is insinuated by S Bernard epist. 190 And the same may be proued of the rest of the Popes since. Now let vs see whom Bel opposeth to these so many, so holy, so antient witnesses.

S. Irenæ. S. Cyprian. S Lucius. S. Hierom. S. Theodoret. S. Gelasius 1. S. Ihon. 2. S. Gregory. Agatho. Nicolas 1. Leo 9. S. Bernard.

9 Forsooth Nicolas de Lyra a late fryer. O truly said of S. Paule, that Hereriks are *condemned by their owne iudgments*. For who condemneth not him self if he will beleeue one late writer, before so many, so holy, so antient. And much more, if that Author be found to affirme nothing to the contrary For he only saith, That *Summi Pontifices inuenuntur apostatasse à fide*. Popes haue apostated from the faith. which is a far different thing For wel may one be an Apostata, and yet teach the doctrin of his Predecessor. As S Peter denyed his maister, & yet taught no contrary doctrin. S. Marcellin

Bel p. 230. Lyra in cap. 16. Math. Tit. 3. v. 11. Math. 26. v 70. Concil. Sinuessan. Damasus in Marcellino.

cellin offered sacrifice to Idols, and yet taught no Idolatry. Caïphas murdered Christ, and yet prophecyed. For as S. Austin said of some Bishops that they durst not teach heresy, lest they should leese their Bishopriks. So we might say of Popes, that though some of them had apostated from Christ, yet they durst not teach heresy, or apostasy, lest they shold be deposed, but might *with a wicked, and deceitful hart* (to vse S. Austins words) *preach things, which are right, and true*, or (as S. Paul speaketh) *preach Christ vpon occasion not vpon truth* But indeed neuer did any Pope in his hart apostatat from Christ.

Ioan. 11. 7. 51.

S. Augustin. l. de doctr. Christian. c. 27. 10. 3.

Philip. 1. 17. 18.

Bel impugneth an opinion for tradition.

10. That point of our ladies conception without sinne is no Tradition, but a pious, and probable opinion of many, and denyed of diuers Catholiques, as of S. Thomas, & S. Bernard whome Bel him self citeth and others. And as for Constantins baptisme at Rome it concerneth no matter of saluation, but is a meere historical Tradition, sufficiently proued by Card. Baronius Annal. Ann. 3 4. and vnawares contested by Bel him self when he saith, that *he hath seen at Rome the font, and that Constantin is worthely called great.* For why shold that font be conserued so long, but as a monument of so memorable a christning. How can Constantin

Bel impugneth a History in steed of tradition.

pag. 133.

See Nicephor. lib. 7. c. 35.

ſtantin be worthely ſurnamed great of Chriſtians. if at his death he communicated with Arians, and was baptized of them at Nicomedia, as their fellow heretik Euſebius firſt reported to purchaſe credit to his hereſy. If this had bene ſo, he ſhold rather haue bene ſyrnamed of Catholiques the Apoſtata, or Heretike.

11. The laſt tradition of honoring Saints (Bel ſaith) made ſome to honor Heretiks for Saints *as Platina* (ſaith he) *writeth of the corps of Herman an heretike honored as Saints reliques at Ferrara for 20. years together*: Anſwer How Apoſtolical a thing the honoring of Saints is, Bellarmin sheweth lib. de Sanct. beatit. c. 19. Where beſids Scriptures, and Councels he proueth it by the teſtimony of 30. Fathers, wherof 25 liued aboue a thowſand years ago. But is not this a ſtrange metamorphoſis, to make the error of common people a popish Tradition. Beſide Platina affirmeth no ſuch thing him ſelfe, but only, that ſome others write ſo. But nether he nor any other write, that it roſe of popish Tradition. That is Bels accuſtomed vſe of addition. And therfore where he noteth danger in beleeuing Tradition, he might haue noted danger in crediting his owne relation. Yea what danger is in not beleeuing Roman Tradition, appeareth both by the teſti-

Bel p. 133.

Platina in Bonif. 8.

vntruth 97

testimony of Fathers before cited, and by the example of Policrates and his fellows the Quartadecimans, and by S. Cyprian, and his followers the Donatists reproued only by Roman Tradition. As testifyeth Tripartit lib. 9. c. 38. and Vincent Lyrinen: But suppose that they of Ferrara had vpon Tradition taken occasion to commit Idolatry. Shal we reiect al things wherof men take occasion to offend? So we might reiect Christ who was set vnto the ruine of many Luc 2. v.34. and by whom the Iewes took occasion of scandal: So we might reiect Scripturs, by which heretiks haue taken occasion of heresy: Sunne and Moone becausse Gentils haue by them fallen into Idolatry. Cannot Bel distinguish between vse, & abuse of Traditions, betwixt scandal giuen & taken. Thus much of the certainty of Traditions: Now let vs come to the examination of them.

Quartadecimans are Heretiks ex Epiphan. hær. 50. & 70.
Nicephor. l. 4. c. 39.
August. hær. 29.
Socrates lib. 5. c. 22.
Tripartita hist.
Vincent. Lyrin.

Chap. XI.

Of the examination of Traditions.

APostolical Traditions are not to be examined by Scripture. This is against Bel pag. 117. but euident. Becausse Apostolical Tradition is the Apostles word, their word, is Gods word 1. Thess. 2. v. 16. But Gods

Bel p. 117
S. Paul.
S. Luke.

Gods word is not to be examined at al: Ergo: nether is Apoſtolical Tradition. Wel might the Church at firſt examine a Tradition, whether it were Apoſtolical or no (as she did examine diuers parts of the Bible whither they were Scripture or no) but finding it to be Apoſtolical, she could no more examine it by the Bible, then she can examin one part of the Bible by an other. And Bel in ſaying *That the new teſtament may be examined by the old* sheweth him ſelfe rather to be a Iew then a Chriſtian. For how dare he examin that which is certaine to be deuine truth? Or how can he examin the new teſtament by the old, if he be not more certain of the old then of the new. But how Traditions ought to be proued heare Tertullian. *It can not ſeeme none, or a doubtful fault againſt Cuſtome, which is to be defended for it name ſake, and is ſufficiently authorized by protection of conſent. Plainly reaſon is to be enquired, but ſo as the Cuſtome be reteined, not to deſtroy it but to vphold it That thou maiſt obſerue it more, when thou art ſure of the reaſon of it. But what a thing is it that one shal cal Cuſtome in queſtion, when he hath fallen from it.*

Bel p. 135. al. 117.

Tertullian. lib. de Corona.

2. *But* (ſaith Bel) *Scriptures are called Canonical becauſe they be the rule of faith. Therfore al things are to be examined by them.* And for *this cauſe* (ſaith he) *Eſay ſent vs to the Law and teſtimony*

Bel p. 117.

Eſaia 8.

Malach. 4. mony to try the truth. Malachias bid vs be mindful
Psalm. 119. of Moises lavv. Dauid said Gods vvord is a lāthern
2. Pet. 1. S. Peter a shyning light. For this cause Christ ex-
Ioan. 5. horted the Iewes to read Scripturs, and said the
Math. 22. Phariſes erred, becauſe they knevv not the Scripturs.
Act. 17. The Berkeans examined S. Paules doctrin, S. Ihon
2. Ioan. 4. bid try the ſpirits: S. Paul pronounced him accurſed
Gal. 1. That preached any doctrin not conteined in Scrip-
ture as S. Auſtin and S. Baſil expound him

S. Auguſt l. 3. cont. Petil. c. 6. S. Baſil ſum. 72 c. 1. *Bible only Canonical Scripture, but not it alone Canonical.* Sup. c. 2. pag. 1. & 7. & c. 9 paragr. 27.

3. Anſwer. The Bible alone is called Canonical Scripture, becauſe it alone of al Scripturs the Church followeth as an infallible rule in beleeuing, or defyning any thing. But it nether is, nor is called the only Canon of faith. In the reſt Bel affirmeth, but proueth not that that was the cauſe why the Scripture ſaid ſo. As for the places of Eſay, Malachy, Dauid and S. Peter they haue bene anſwered before. As for exhortation of Chriſt, I might deny that he there exhorted the Iewes to read Scripture, but affirmed that they did read them, becauſe they thought they conteined life. But ſuppoſe he did exhort them to read Scripturs for to finde whether he were the Meſſias or no, whereas he ſaith there, they giue teſtimony, what is this for trying of al matters by them. Can Bel inferre an vniuerſal propoſitiō of one ſinguler? That of the Phariſes conteineth two corruptions of Scripturs.

Scrutamini Scripturas. See S. Cyrill. l. 1. in Ioan. c. 4.

Corrupt. of Script.

For

For neither did Christ say, The Pharases, but the Saduces erred about the resurrection, nether doth he say the cause of their error therin was only ignorance of Scripture (as Bel insinuateth leauing out the words, *powre of God*,) but ignorance both of Scripture, and of Gods powre: *you erre* (saith he) *knowing nether Scripturs, nor the powre of God.* So if they had known Gods powre, though it had not bene by Scripture but by Tradition, or reuelation (as Iob and the faithful vncircumcised did) they had not erred about the resurrection. Beside, the resurrection is a perticuler matter, and euidently testifyed in Scripture, what proueth this concerning al points of faith ?

1. 2. *Math.* 22. v. 29. *Iob* 19. v. 25.

4. As for the Berhæans whom Bel wil haue to haue examined the truth of S. Pauls doctrin: I ask of him whither they were faithful whilst they examined it, or faithles? If faithles, why proposeth he them to vs as an example to imitat? If he wil follow them let him confesse him selfe to want faith, & none wil discommend him for examining ether Traditions, or Scripture; For in infidels such examination is some disposition to faith, but in the faithful an argument of doubt, and distrust. If faithful? how could they examin, whither that were true or no, which they assuredly beleeued to be deuine truth?

Act. 17.

truth? Wherfore they examined not the truth of S. Pauls doctrin. For *they receaued it* (saith S. Luke) *with al greedines, and beleeued*: but did for confirmation and encreafe of their faith, *fearch the Scriptures whether thefe things were fo or no*, vz in Scripture, that is fortold in Scripture; And this kind of examining Traditions we difalow not.

How the Bethzeans examined S. Pauls doctrin.

What S. Ihon bid vs trye.

1. Ioan. 4.

5. As for S. Ihon: He bid vs try doubtful fpirits, but not Apoftolical fpirits, or Traditions. Befids he bid vs not try them only by Scripture, and therfore he maketh nothing for Bels purpofe. Finally as for S. Paul he accurfed not (as S Auftin noteth tract 98. in Ioan) him that should preach more then he had done. For fo he should preiudice him felfe, who coueted to returne to the Theffalonians to preach more then he had done, and to fupply (as he writeth the points which wanted to their faith. But only fuch as preach things *befide* (vz quite) *that Ghofpel which he had preached*, which things v 6 and 7. he calleth an other Ghofpel inuerting Chrifts Ghofpel. Such were the cirrumcifion, & obferuation of Iewish ceremonies, againft which he difputeth in the whole epiftle But what is this againft Apoftolical Traditions, are they a fecond Ghofpel? do they inuert Chrifts Ghofpel? are they Iewish ceremonies.

S. Auguftin. to. 9.

2. Theff. 3. v. 10.

How S. Paul vnder ftood the word befyde Gal 1. v. 2.

6. Be-

6. Beſide S. Paul nether ſpeaketh of Scripture, nor can be vnderſtood of it alone. For when he ſaith (*beſids that vvhich vve haue euangeliZed to you*) he nether had written any thing before to the Galathians; Nor then, nor after writ to them al points of Chriſtian faith. And therfore when he ſpeaketh of his owne euangelizing both in tyme before the writing of that epiſtle, and vnto the Galathians, euident it is he meant not of euangelizing by only writing, but rather of euangelizing by word of mouth, becauſe before the writing of that epiſtle, he had euangelized to the Galathians only by word of mouth, and of that euangelizing he ſpeaketh, which before tymes he had vſed to them. And ſo this place maketh more for vs then for Bel.

S. Paul ſpeaketh not of Scripture but of his owne preaching.

The like ſaieth S. Ignat. epiſt. ad Heron. of thoſe that teach prater ea quæ tradita ſunt.

7. As for S. Auſtin, and S. Baſil they ſay not That S. Paul meant of euangelizing by only Scripture, but out of this place infer, that nothing is to be preached which is beſide Scripture, in that ſenſe wherin S. Paul vſed the word (*Beſide*) vz: ſo beſide as it is an other Ghoſpel, inuerting Chriſts Ghoſpel, which they rightly inferred. For what is ſo beſide Scripture, as it is a new Ghoſpel, and inuerteth Chriſts Ghoſpel, is in like ſort beſide that which S. Paul had euangelized to the Galathians, and no Apoſtolical

Tradition, but a curſed doctrin. And thus much of Bels proofs out of Scripture touching examination of Traditions; Now let vs ſee his proofs out of Fathers.

Chap. XII.

Bels arguments out of holy Fathers about the examination of Traditions anſwered.

Bel p. 117. vntruth 98 vntruth 99

First he ſaith, *That in S. Cyprians daies nether Tradition was a ſufficient proofe of doctrin, nor the Popes definitiue ſentence a rule of faith.* Theſe be both vntruths. For that Traditiō was a ſufficient proofe of doctrin in S. Cyprians daies is euident by the teſtimony of his maiſter Tertullian, S. Ireney, and S. Dioniſ. before his tyme, and S. Baſil, S. Chriſoſtom & others after his tyme before cited. And by his owne words before alleadged, and the decyding of two controuerſies only by Tradition, the one in his owne tyme about the baptiſme of heretiks, the other before his tyme about the tyme of Eaſter. Nether did he euer doubt that true Tradition was ſufficient proofe of doctrin of which S. Chriſoſtom ſaid. *It is Tradition, ſeeke no more*: but thought (and truly) that humane, and miſtaken Tradition was no ſufficient rule, as hath bene ſhewed before.

Sup. cap. 4. S. Auguſt. in 12. de bapt. c. 9. Tripartit. l. 9. c. 38. Vincent. Lyrin. Socrates lib. 5. c. 22. Te pacatum reddat traditio. Baſil. hom. contr. Sabellian. Chryſoſt. hom. 42. 2. ad Theſſal. Cap. cit. parag. 6.

And

And that the Popes definitiue ſentence in his tyme was a ſufficient rule of faith is euident by his owne ſaying. *That falſe faith can haue no acceſſe to S. Peters chair*, and that *Hereſyes, and Schiſmes riſe not, but becauſe it is not thought that there is for the tyme one Prieſt in the Church, and one iudge in Chriſts roome*, and by his owne ſubſcribing at the laſt to the Popes commandement, though he thought it had bene contrary to Scripture. Nether did he euer withſtand the Popes definitiue ſentence. For P. Steeuen did not defyne as a matter of faith, but only commanded that ſuch should not be rebaptized, but the Tradition obſerued, as both S. Cyprian: Euſebius. Vincent Lyrinen: and others teſtify. And this command S. Cyprian did not at firſt obey, wherin he offended as S. Auſtin writeth though after he did. as the ſame S. Auſtin doth likewiſe teſtify. And no doubt but he thought as wel of the Popes decrees as S Hierom did, when he wrote to P. Damaſus: *Decree I pray if it pleaſe you I will not fear to ſay three Hypoſtaſes if you bid.* And requeſted him for Chriſts ſake to giue authority, ether to affirme or deny three hypoſtaſes. And dareſt thou Bel make no account of the Popes ſentence, when ſo great and holy a Doctor, ſo highly eſteemed it, as without it he durſt nether affirme, nor deny

Cyprian. lib. 4 epiſtol. 8. calleth Rome the Matrice and roote of the Catholique Church.

S. Cyprian. l. 1. epiſt. 1.

S. Auguſtin. l. 6. de bapt. contr. Donat c. 2.

S. Cyprian. ep. ad Pompeium.

Euſeb. lib. 7. hiſt. c 3.

Vincent. Lyrin.

S. Auguſtin. lib. de vnic. bapt. cap. 13. See c. 4. parag. 7. & 8.

S. Hieroms account of the Popes decrees.

three hypostases, and with it doubted not to do ether.

Bel p. 118. 2. After this Bel alleadgeth the practise of Fathers, who *When the Arians* (saith he) *vntruth 100.* *would not admit the word homousion because it was not in Scripture* (mark how he confesseth him selfe to imitate Arians) *the Fathers did not prone it by Tradition, nor say that many vnwritten things are to be beleeued.* This is not so. For S. Athanasius saith that the Bishops of the Nicen Councel did not inuent that word, but set it downe *testimonio patrum* by testimony of their Fathers, and Eusebius though an Arian confesseth the same. And S. Gregory Nazian. writing against the Arians saith, that it should suffice vs that our Fathers thought not as they do; and the same argumēt vseth also S. Athanasius writing against the Apollinarists. And how vntruly he affirmeth, that the Fathers did not say many vnwritten things are to be beleeued, I refer my selfe to their testimonies alleadged aboue cap. 4. But saith Bel S. Athanasius proued *homousion*, because though the word was not in Scripture the sense was. A goodly reason: He proued it out of Scripture, therfore not out of Tradition; as if one should say. He proued it out of S. Ihon therfore not out of S. Paul.

S. Athan. apud Theodoret. l. 1. c. 8. See epist. ad Epictetum, l. cit. Apud Athanas. & Theodoret. l. cit. S. Grego. Nazianz. orat. 2. de Theolog.

Bel p. 118. 3. Origen (saith Bel) hom. 25. in Math. and

and hom. 1. in 1. Hierem counſelleth vs to try al doctrins by Scripture. This is vntrue. For Origen ſpeaketh not of al, but only of our opinions, and doctrins. *Our opinions and expoſitions* (ſaith he) *haue no credit without their teſtimonies.* Againe: *We muſt alleadge the ſenſe of Scripture, for teſtimony of al the words we vtter.* Tertullian calling that truth which is firſt, and falſe which is after, maketh nothing to his purpoſe. Next he alleadgeth S. Auſtin ſaying, *That we muſt not conſent euen to Catholique Bishops error, or priuat opinion againſt Scripture.* Error againſt Scripture is not to be followed. Ergo: nether Apoſtolical Traditions conteſted by the whole Church. Surely Bel hath great facility in inferring *quodlibet ex quolibet*: He bringeth alſo S. Chriſoſtom calling *Gods lawes a moſt exact rule*, and bidding vs *learn not what this, or that man thinks, and of theſe things enquire theſe points alſo out of Scripture. Anſwer.* S. Chryſoſtoms meaning is, that Gods word is moſt exact in the matter whereof he talked: vz. whither pouerty be to be preferred before riches, in which matter *we ought* (ſaith he) *to leaue the opinions of this, or that worldly man, who prefer riches, but ſeek what the Scripture ſaith of it.* And Bel to make him ſeeme to ſay, That al truth is to be ſought out of Scripture, tranſlated theſe words,

vntruth 101 Origen.

S. Auguſtin. lib. de vnit. eccleſ. c. 10. to. 7.

S. Chryſoſt. hom. 13. in 2. Cor. to. 4.

Falſe tranſlat. 13.

Deque his à Scripturis hæc etiam inquirite, thus: Search the truth out of the Scriptures Englishing nether *de his*, nor *hæc*.

pag. 120. 4. After S. Chryſoſtom he citeth two
Chap. 5. parag. 5. ſentences out of Victoria cited by him, and anſwered by vs before, To whome he ad-
Canus l. 3. de loc. c. vlt. ioyneth Canus teaching. That *Prieſts are not to be heard vnles they teach according to Gods law.* Certain: And then inferreth, That *Papiſts teach plainly that no doctrine is to be receaued,* 1. *which is not tryed by Gods word.* True alſo, if it be rightly vnderſtood, vz. of ſuch doctrine as may be tryed, not of deuine, (as Apoſtolical Traditions be,) which may not 2. be tryed. And of Gods whole word, not of 3. a part thereof (as the Scripture is. And that expounded not according to the humor of priuat ſpirits, but according to the vniforme conſent of Fathers & Councels. This moſt iuſt and reaſonable rule of trying al matters in controuerſy the Councel of Trent preſcribed to the Proteſtants. But they wil try deuine truth conteined not only in Traditions, but alſo in Scripture, & that part by which they wil try the reſt, they wil expound according to their owne priuat ſpirits, which is to make them ſelfs rule and iudges of al: wherfore vainly doth pag. 120. Bel profeſſe to agree with the Pope in al cõtrouerſies if he wil be tryed by Gods word.

Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 18. in ſaluo cõductu dato Proteſtantibus.

For

For vnles Bel be made iudge, and tryer both of Gods word, and of his meaning, or (as Proteſtants ſpeake) vnles he may iudge which is Scripture, and which is the true ſenſe, there muſt nether tryal, nor iudgement paſſe. For vnles Proteſtants may haue al the law in their owne hands they wil accept no iudgement.

5. But becauſe Bellarmin graunteth, that *ſinguli Epiſcopi*: al Bishops ſeuerally may erre, and ſomtyme do erre, and diſſent one from an other, ſo that we know not which of them is to be followed: Bel thinketh that he hath a great catch. yet remembring him ſelf better, that though Catholiques graunt that euery Bishop ſeuerally may erre, yet deny that they can erre al, when they are gathered in a Synode confirmed by the Pope, he taketh occaſion to make a long digreſſion about Councels. Bellarm. lib. 2. de Concil. c. 12. pag. 121.

Chap. XIII.

Of the authority of late general Councels.

General Councels in theſe our dayes are as certaine as before tymes. This is againſt Bel pag. 123. ſaying, *that in our dayes they are like a noſe of waxe, and as vncertaine as the Winde.* And becauſe he denyeth

not, but that general Councels in some times haue bene certaine (forsooth such as defyned nothing contrary to Protestantisme) I wil only proue, that they are now as certaine as euer. First because Christ promyseth, that *he would be in the midst of them that are gathered in his name.* Math. 18. v. 20. That *the holy Ghost should teach vs al truth.* Iohn. 16. That *the gates of hel should not preuaile against his Church.* Math. 16. v. 18. which promises are limited to no certaine tyme, but are extended (as he saith Math. vlt.) *euen to the end of the worlde,* Likewise Christs commaund of hearing his Church. Math. 18. of hearing preachers sent by him. Luc. 10. of obeying our Prelates and being subiect to them. Hebr. 13. v. 17. bindeth as wel in our dayes as before tymes. wherfore either the Church, Preachers, and Prelates teaching in a general Councel in our dayes, can not erre, or Christ in our daies commaundeth vs to beleeue heresy and lyes.

S. Math. *S. Iohn. v. 13.* *S. Math.* *S. Math. v. 17.* *S. Luc.* *S. Paul.*

2. Secondly the present Church of our daies hath authority to decyde controuersies in faith: Ergo, we be bound to obey her decision: Ergo, it is no lye. The Antecedent is an article of Protestants faith. The first consequence I proue, because who resisteth power in matters belonging to the power *resisteth Gods ordinance, and purchaseth* damna-

Article 39. art. 20.

damnation to him ſelfe. Roman. 13. verſ. 2. which being true of temporal power, and concerning wordly matters, much more true it is of ſpiritual power, and in matters of faith, and ſaluation: The ſecond conſequence is euident. For God who is truth it ſelfe, and can not lye, can not binde vs (eſpecially vnder paine of damnation) to beleeue and follow lyes. Thirdly as Proteſtants except againſt the Councels in their tymes, al hereticks may except againſt the Councels of their tymes, and ſo none shal be condemned as Hereticks, no Councel certaine, but al things remaine as vncertaine, as if there had neuer been any Councel at al, which is to take away the end of calling Councels. For if they can not make things certaine, to what purpoſe are they gathered. Finally Bel can giue no ſufficient reaſon, whie general Councels be not as certaine now as euer, as shal appeare by the anſwer to this his obiection.

See S. Gregory lib. 1. epiſt. 24.

See l. Marciani. C. de ſum. Trinit.

3. He obiecteth that Bellarmin lib. 2. de Concil. cap. 11. writeth: that is the true decree of the counſel, which is made of the greater part. But Canus ſaith lib. 5. de locis cap. 4. q. 2. *That voices prevaile not with vs, as in humane aſſemblies.* Againe, *theſe matters of faith are iudged not by number*, but by waight. And the grauity and authority of the Pope is it,

Canus.

is it, which giueth waight to Councels. Ergo, (saith Bel) there can be no certainty in Councels. A goodly reason, sutely; Two Catholique writers agree not whether should be accompted the decree of a councel, if the greater number of Bishops should define against the Pope, and the lesser number of Bishops. Ergo no councel in our dayes is certaine. As if nothing were certaine, if two Catholiques disagree about it. Wil Bel allowe mee to argue soe against Protestants? I beleeue I should finde scarce any one pointe of faith certaine amongst them. But he should rather haue inferred: Bellarmin, Canus, and al Catholique writers agree, that it is the decree of the Councel, and certaine truth, which the greater part of Bishops defineth, and the Pope confirmeth. Ergo general councels in our dayes are certaine; Namely that of Trent, in which the most, yea al (as appeareth by their subscriptions) defyned, the Pope confirmed.

Bel p. 111. 112.

4. I might omit a friuolous obiection, which he maketh against Bellarmin of contradiction. Because Bellarmin saith, that *the assemblie of Bishops in lawful councels is an assembly of Iudges, and their decrees laws necessarily to be followed.* And yet affirmeth that *it is al one for Councels to be reproued by the Pope, and*

Bellarm. lib. 2. de concil. c. 18.

Cap. 11.

to doe

to doe againſt his ſentence: For though Bellarmin affirme Biſhops to be Iudges, and their iudgement to be neceſſarily followed as law. Yet as himſelfe explicateth cap 11. it is not neceſſarily to be followed *antequam accedat ſententia Summi Pontificis.* before it be confirmed by the Pope. As the Peeres in parliament are Iudges, and their acts neceſſary to be followed, but not before they be confirmed by the Prince, who in not confirming them, diſannulleth them.

5. And becauſe Bellarmin writeth, that one cauſe whie the Pope was neuer perſonally in any Councel of the Eaſt was, leaſt he being then the Emperours temporal ſubiect ſhould be placed vnder the Emperour. Bel inferreth both that the Pope is prowd, and that the Eaſt Church neuer acknowledged his ſupremacy. But as for pride it is none, to honour (as S. Paule did) his miniſtery, to challendge the place due to his dignity, and authority. For (as S. Gregory a moſt humble man ſaid) *Let vs keep humility in mynde, and yet conſerue the dignity of our order in honour.* No maruaile then if Popes being head and preſidents of Councels, where matters of Church and faith are handled, and Emperours (as S. Gregory Nazianz: ſpeaketh) but sheep of his flocke, and ſubiect to his power, and tribunal, did looke

Bellarm. lib. 2. de conc. c. 19.

pag. 122.

Rom. 11. 7. 14.

S. Gregor. lib. 4 epiſt. 36. ad Eulogium.

S. Gregor. Nazianz. orat. 14. ad ſub.

to ſit

to ſit there aboue Emperours. Yet the great Emperour Theodoſius highly commended S. Ambroſe for putting him out of the Chauncel: And in the Nicene Counſel Conſtantine that worthie Emperour entred laſt, and after al the Bishops were ſett; nor did not ſit in a great throne beſeeming his eſtate, but in a low chaire, and that not before he had craued pardon, and asked leaue of the Bishops, as Theodoret whom Bel calleth a Saint, Nicephorus, and others doe teſtify. Albeit the Nouatian hereticke Sozomene, who lyeth much (as writeth S. Gregory) doe ſeeme to ſay, that he ſate at the toppe of the Councel, in a moſt great throane.

Theodoret. lib.5.c.18.

Euſeb. lib.3. de vit. Conſtant.

Theodoret. lib.1.c 7. Nicephor. l. 12. c. 19.

Sozome.lib. 1. c. 19. Cregor. l. 6. epiſt.31. Nouel. 9. & C.de ſumm. Trinit. lib. vltimo. Concil. Calced.act.1. Athanaſ. apol.2. Socrates lib. 2.cap. 13. Sext. Sinod. act. 18. Theodoret. lib. 5.c.9. Euap. lib. 1. c. 4. Martian. ep. ad Leonem. Gelaſ. ep.ad Epiſcopum Dordon. Concil. Nicen.epiſt.ad Siluest.

6. As for the Eaſterne churches acknowledging the Popes primacy, it is ſo manifeſt, as Iuſtinian Emperour of the Eaſt writeth. *No man doubteth but that at Rome is Summi Pontificatus apex: the toppe of the prieſthood.* And if more witneſſes need in ſo euident a matter, certaine it is, that the general councels in the Eaſt were called, and their decrees confirmed by the Pope. And the Councel of Calcedon profeſſeth in plaine tearms, that *omnis primatus, al primacy belonged to the Archbishoppe of Rome*, & the ſame acknowledge the Grecians in the ſeauenth ſynode in the Councels of Lateran, Lyons, and

and Florence. Likewiſe ſome Patriarches of the Eaſt (to omit Bishops) were by the Popes authority created, as Anatholius of Conſtantinople by Pope Leo epiſt. 53. ad Pulcheriam, others depoſed as Anthimus of Conſtant: Dioſcorus, and Timothie of Alexandria, and Peeter of Antioche. Other being depoſed or vexed appealed to Popes, as S. Athanaſius and Peter of Alexandria, S. Paul, S. Chriſoſtom: and S. Flauian of Conſtantinople, Paulin of Antioch: which euidently proueth the Popes Primacy ouer them. Finally to omit the teſtimony of S. Athanaſius, S, Baſil, S. Chriſoſtom, Theodoret, and other Doctors and ſaints of the Eaſt church, both the Emperour and Patriarche of Conſtantinople did in S. Gregories time (as he witneſſeth) daily profeſſe the church of Conſtantinople to be vnder the Romane Sea.

Leo epiſt. 59. 60. 61.
Conc. Conſtant. ep. ad Damaſ.
Concil. Calced. act. 16.
7. Sinod. act. 2.
Conc. Lateran. 13. c. 15.
Concil. Florent. in lit. vnionis.
Concil. Lugdun. in 6. tit. de election. cap. vbi periculum.
Baron. 536.
Concil. Calced. act. 5.
Gelaſ. ep. ad Fauſtum.
Sozom. lib. 3. c. 7.
Baron. Ann. 372.
Baron. 342.
Chryſoſt. epiſt. ad Innocent.
Ex lit. Leon. & Valent. ad Theodoſ.
Athanaſ. ep. ad Felicem.
Baſil. ep. 52. ad Athan.
Chriſoſt. ep. ad Innocen.
Theodoret. epiſt. ad Renatum.
Gregor. l. 7. epiſt. 63.

7. Now to his reaſon. Bellarmin ſaith. The Emperour of the Eaſt would haue ſate in Councel aboue the Pope. Ergo, the Eaſt church neuer acknowledged his primacy. Who ſeeth nôt the manifolde weaknes of this reaſon. Firſt I deny, that any religious Emperour of the Eaſt would haue ſate aboue the Pope in Councel, as appeareth by the fact of the two great Emperours Conſtantin, and Theodoſius before rehearſed, and

and by Iustinus humbling himselfe vnto the Pope prostrate on the ground, Iustinians lowly adoring, and Iustinian the second his kissing of his feeet. Is it likely that these who so honoured the Pope out of Councel, would haue sate aboue him in Councel? And albeit one grecian Emperour, after both religion, and reuerence thereto was decayed in Greece, and the whole nation fallen into Schisme and heresy, did in the Coūcel of Florence attempt to sit aboue the Pope, yet the like is not to be thought of other religious Christian Emperours, whereof, diners as Bel testifyeth art. 1. pag. 17. humbled themselues, and yeelded euen their soueraigne rights to Popes. Yea the selfe same Emperour, who by some euil suggestion would haue sate aboue the Pope, would at his first meeting with him haue kneeled vnto him. But suppose that the grecian Emperours, by reason of their temporal superiority, would haue sitten aboue the Pope, Doe they therefore deny his spiritual primacy? No more surely then a gentleman doth deny his pastours spiritual authority ouer him, because he wil sit aboue him. Did not the grecians euen in the Florentin Councel, where they attempted to place the Emperour aboue the Pope, defyne together with the Latins, that the Bishop

See Art. 1. c. 6. parag. 6.

Concil. Florent. in initio.

Concil. Florent. sup.

In lit. vnionis.

Bishop of Rome hath *primatum in vniuersum orbem*, primacy ouer the whole world.

8. In two other matters Bel iniuryeth the Pope, auouching, *that he would neuer shew his face in any Councel.* And *that he shamefully abuseth the worlde, because he can not communicate his supreame iudicial authority to his Legates, and will approue nothinge decreed in Councel, vnles it be agreable to that vvhich he decreeth a part in his chaire at home.* For the first of these is a manifest vntruth; because the Pope hath bene personally present almost in al the general councels holde in the west, as at Florence, at Constance, at Viena, at Lyons, at Rhemes, at Claremount, and diuers councels of Lateran. In the other the Pope abuseth the worlde no more, then doth the Prince abuse the Parliament, when sending thither the L. Chauncellor to supplie his place, and præseed in his roome, wil neuertheless approue nothing what the Peeres doe, or decree, vnles himselfe iudgeth it conuenient. Bel p. 113. vntruth 102. vntruth 103.

Chap. XIIII.

Of the oath vvhich Bishops vse to make vnto the Pope.

Because Bishops sweare fidelity to the Pope, and to keep and defend the primacy

primacy of the Romane Church, and rules of holy fathers against al men, and neuertheles as Bellarmin writeth, are not to obey him, but when he commandeth according to Gods law, and holy canons, and may notwithstanding their oath speake their minde in councel, and depose the Pope, if he become an heretike. Bel inferreth diuers things requisit to be answered: First, that *Bishops sweare the Pope can depose al Emperours and Kings in the Christian wordle.* Secondly, that *they sweare to admit his decree, whome they freely graunt may be an hereticke:* Thirdly, that *they sweare obedience to him in matters of faith, whome they can depose for heresy:* Fourthly, that *the Pope is not supreame Iudge of controuersies, seeing Bishops may examyne and iudge, whether what he commaundeth be agreable to Gods worde, and the Canons.* Lastly, that *they sweare flat rebellion against their Souraigns, seeing they sweare to defend the Popes Primacy against al men whomsoeuer.*

Bellarm. lib. 1. de concil. cap. vlt.

pag. 125. 126.

vntruth 104.

2. Answer. As for the oath of Bishops made to the Pope the lawfulnes thereof appeareth, because it is made withal Catholique princes consent, and meant only in iust and lawful things, which are according to Gods law, and holy Canons. And it hath bene vsed aboue a thowsand yeare agoe, as is euident by the like oath made by a Bishop vnto

S. Gregory the great. And S. Boniface the Apostle of Germany, and worthiest man that euer England bredde, did sweare when he was consecrated Bishop *to concurre with the Pope and commodities of his church.* And as for the first point which Bel inferreth, it is vntrue, as appeareth by the answer to the first article. The second and third contayne no inconuenience. For we must obey what he decreeth, or defyneth Iudicially as sitting in S. Peeters chaire, though in hart he were an hereticke. As our Sauiour cõmanded the Iewes to follow what the Scribes taught out of Moyses chaire, but abstaine from their priuate leauen. If Bel can not imagine how a man by Gods disposition may vtter truth cõtrary to his owne minde, let him remember Balaam, and Caiphas, and what hath bene said before out of S. Austin. Besides we graunt not freely, as Bel freely forgeth, that the Pope may be an hereticke. For Bellarmin (*whose only testimony* saith Bel *is most sufficient in al popish affaires*) defendeth the contrary And by that which hath bene said to these two points appeareth the answer to the fourth. Because Bishops must not examin the doctrine, which the Pope deliuereth iudicially out of S. Peters chaire, as supreame pastour of Gods church, but only that, wherein he vttereth

S. Gregor. l. 10. ep. 31. Baron. Ann. 723.

See Concil. Toler. 11. can. 12.

S. Math. 23. v. 3.

S. Marc. 8. v. 15.

S. Math. 16. v. 6.

Numer. 22. Ioh. 11. v. 51. Chap. 10. parag. 9.

Bellarm. lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. cap. 6. & 7.

Bel p. 115.

his owne priuate opinion.

3. And as for the last point; Bishops sweare no rebellion: Both because they sweare to defend the Popes primacie, only according to Gods worde, and holy Canons, which admit no rebellion. As also because the defence which Bishops are to vse, is not by insurrection and rebellion, but by spiritual chastisment, and correction. In which sort S. Fabian defended the orders of the Church against the Emperour Philip. S. Innocent: defended S. Chrisostom against Archadius. S. Babilas and S. Ambrose punished their Emperours without any rebellion at al.

The weapons of our warfare are not carnal. 1. Cor. 10 v 4. Euseb. lib 6. c. 25. Gelas. epist. ad Anast. S. Chrysost. hib. cont. Gent.

4. After the foresaid collections, Bel auoucheth an vntruth vpon the Rhemists affirming them *to tel plainely and rowndly, that the determination of Councels is needles, because the Popes iudgement alone is infallible.* Where as they in that place which Bel cyteth write, that though the Sea Apostolique haue infallible assistance, yet the determination of Councels are necessary for many causes, as for searching out the truth, for the recouery of hereticks, and contentation of the weake, who not alwaies giuing ouer to one mans determination, yet wil either yeeld to the iudgement of al the learned men, and Bishops of al Nations, or els remaine

pag 128. Rhemists Act 15. *vntruth* 105.

XUM

maine desperate, & condemned before God and man. As the Apostles (say they) though assisted by God, yet thought it necessary to cal a Councel, for decyding a controuersy ryssen in their daies. I omit three other points touched here by Bel: *That the general Councels is aboue the Pope, can, and hath deposed him*, because he neither proueth them, nor they concerne any matter of Catholique faith. And are latdgely and learnedly handled of Bellarmin lib. 2. de concil. And thus much of Bels seauenth article. *Be myndful therefore Bel from whence thou art fallen and doe penance.* Apoc. 2. pag. 128. Apocalip.

THE EIGHT AND LAST ARTICLE OF KEEPING GODS COMMANDEMENTS.

CHAP. I.

The possibility of keeping Gods commandements explicated and proued out of Scripture.

GODS children can by his grace keepe his cõmandements. This Bel absolutly denyeth pag. 143. 148. 149 and 152. though in the very beginning of this article he were a shamed to deny it plainly, but admitteth it (saith he) in a godly sence, and in some sort, and only denyeth it in a Popish sence. But this godly sence is so vngodly, and the sort so sory, as he is ashamed to vtter it. For as S. Hierom writeth of the Pelagians, to haue discouered the opinions of Protestants, is to haue ouercome them, the blasphemy is manifest at the first: yet may we gather his meaning by that he saith pag. 149. That God hath giuen vs those com-

S. Hieron. epist. ad Ctesiphontem. Iren. lib. 1. cap. 35.

commandements, which we can not poſſibly keep, and pag. 144. that euery breach of them is of it nature deadly. The miſtery therefore of his counſel is, that Gods children can not poſſiblie, euen with his grace keepe his commandements, but that they muſt needs oftentymes breake them deadly. This kinde of keeping Gods commandements he tearmeth imperfect, and vnexact keeping. But indeed it is no keeping at al, nor a point of Gods children but of the diuels, and a true breaking of them. For how are they Gods children, if they loue him not, how loue they him, if they damnably offend? If you loue me ſaith Chriſt Ioh. 14. v. 15. keepe my commaundements; & how can they keepe them, if they damnably, and deadly breake them? can true keeping, and true breaking ſtand together. 5. Ioh.

2. God commaunded his precepts to be kept, not ſo ſillily as Bel would, ſo as they be oftentimes deadly broken; but as Dauid ſaith *Nimis ſphodra* Pſal. 118. v. 8. *God* (ſaith S. Auſtin vpon that place conc. 4.) *hath very much commaunded his precepts to be very much kept.* And according to S. Iames, *Who offendeth in one is guilty of al.* Wherfore deadly breaking of one of Gods lawes, can no more ſtand with keeping them, then theſte or murder can ſtande with keeping the Pſalm. S. Auſtin. S. Iames 2. v. 10.

Princes lawes. Nor they, who oftentimes deadly breake Gods lawes, be his children whileſt they doe ſo, more then theeues and murderers be good ſubiects. And as for the Popish ſence, it is not as Bel falſlie impoſeth, that we can keepe Gods commaundements ſo perfectly, as we be free from ſinne: For ſo (as S. Iohn ſaith) we ſhould deceaue our ſelues, and as Bel confeſſeth we doe daily acknowledge our ſinnes, but ſo as we be free from deadly ſinne, which deſtroieth charity the end of the law, and keepe the commaundements in al great, though not in ſmal matters. For as S. Hierom ſaith we may be without *cacia*, though not *ſina amartia*, or as S. Auſtin, and S. Gregory gather out of S. Paul *ſine crimine*, though not *ſine peccato*, that is without great ſinne, though not without ſmal ſinne, without mortal, though not without venial. And to keepe Gods commaundements in this ſort, is ſubſtantially to keepe them, becauſe we breake not the end of them, which is charity; and yet not perfectly, & exactly, as who ſtealeth but trifles keepeth the Princes lawes, though not perfectly; but if he ſteale great matters, he is ſaid no more to keepe but to breake them. And in this ſence, doe Catholiques defend the foreſaid cõcluſion, which though I might proue many waies, yet

Luther. ſermon. de natiu. B. Mariæ *maketh al Chriſtians as holy as the mother of God.*

Bel p. 150. *The Apoſtles were cleane, and yet had need to haue their feete waſhed.* Ioh. 13. ver. 10. 11.

S Hierom. dialog. 1. cont. Pelag. S. Gregor. 21. moral. c 9. S. Auguſtin. hom. 19. de temp. to 10. lib. 1. contr. duas epiſt. Pelag. c. 14. to 7. enchirid. c 69.

1. Timoth. 1. 7. 5.

yet wil I content my ſelfe with ſuch proo-
fes, as Bel vndertaketh to anſwer, and in
that order as he propoundeth them.

3 Firſt therfore I proue it, becauſe a young man tolde Chriſt *he had kept al the commaundements from his youth*. Bel anſwereth that S. Hierom ſaith he lyed, and S. Auſtin thinketh he ſpake more prowdly then truly, neuertheles more probable it is that he ſpake truly, becauſe not only our Sauiour did not rebuke him (as likely it is he would haue done, if he had tolde him a lye) but, as S. Marcke teſtifieth, *beheld him, & loued him, and ſaid, one thing is wanting to thee, goe ſel whatſoeuer thou haſt, and giue it to the poore, and come, and follow me*. If the mans ſpeeche had bene a lye, it would not haue prouoked Chriſts loue, but his offence; and if he had broken Gods commaundements, Chriſt would haue aduertiſed him whome he loued, rather of keeping the things which he commaunded, then which he counſelled, as is the giuing al we haue to the poore. Wherfore S. Chriſoſtome hom. 64. in Math. ſaith, this man was *no diſſembler*. And S. Hieron. dialog. 2. contra Pelag. affirmeth, that Chriſt loued him, becauſe he ſaid he had done al, *omnia feciſſe ſe dicit, quamobrem & amatur à Domino*: he ſaid that he had done al things, wherfore he was alſo loued

Math. 19. v. 20.

Ed. p. 140.

S Auguſtin. epiſt. 89.

Marc. 10. v. 21.

S. Chryſoſt.

S. Hieron.

of our lorde; which euidently conuinceth that his ſpeeche was true: for Chriſt could not loue him for a lye. Neither wil Bel I hope maruel, that we expound S. Mathew rather by S. Marcke, then by S. Hierome, and S. Auſtin, eſpecially ſeeing S. Hierome alrered his opinion, ad S. Auſtin ſpake but doubtfully, ſaying *I thinke*. Neuertheles becauſe ſome fathers haue thought that the mans ſpeeche was not true, Catholiques rely not vpon this argument.

Rom. 2. 7. 13. 4. Secondly S. Paule ſaith. For not the hearers of the law are iuſt with God, but the Doers of the law ſhal be iuſtified. Ergo there are ſome Doers of the law, and it is

pag. 151. poſſible to be done. Bel anſwereth that the Apoſtle ſpake not abſolutly, but vpon ſuppoſal of a thinge, which (ſaith he) is impoſſible, that there were doers of the law, for ſuch ſaith Bel, *ſhould be iuſtified by their worke, though they could not glory in them.* But that S. Paule ſpake abſolutly, and not vpon any impoſſible ſuppoſal is euident. Firſt becauſe in the firſt part of the ſentence he ſpake abſolutly of hearers, and not vpon any impoſſible ſuppoſal, when he ſaid *they are not iuſt*. Ergo: in the ſecond parte he ſpake ſo of Doers, when he ſaid *they ſhal be iuſtified*. Wherfore as wel may Bel ſay there are no hearers, as no doers of the law. Secondly

goodly because in the next verse before, he had said absolutly. *Whosoeuer haue sinned in the lawe, shal be iudged by the lawe.* Which he proueth saying. *For not the hearers* &c. Wherfore as the proposition which he proued is absolute, and vpon no impossible supposal; so is that by which he proueth it. And in the verse next after he bringeth a proofe, that the Doers of the law shal be iustified, though they heard it not, because *Gentils who haue no lawe, naturally* (that is without instruction of the law) *Doe those things which are of the lawe*: Behould the Apostle auouching that Gentils doe the law, & by their example proving the Doers thereof to be iustified. vers. 12. vers. 14. See S. Austin lib. 4 contra Iulian. cap. 3 tom. 7.

5. And soe frequent it is in scripture to affirme, that there are Doers, and keepers of Gods lawes, as it is auouched more then twenty times in one Psalme 118. *I wil keepe thy iustifications* v. 8. *I haue sought thee in my whole hart.* v. 10. *I haue cleaued to thie testimonies Lorde.* v. 31. *I haue runne the way of thie commaundements.* v. 32. *I wil keepe thy lawe in my whole hart.* v. 34. *I wil keepe thy lawe alwaies.* v. 44. *I haue not declined from thy lawe.* v. 51. *I haue kept thy lawe.* v. 55. *I haue not forgotten thy lawe.* v. 61. *I am partaker of al that keepe thy commaundements.* v. 63. *I haue not forsaken thy commaundements.* v. 87. *I wil keepe* Psalm. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11.

the

12. *the testimonies of thy mouth.* v. 88. *I haue forbidden my feete from euel way, that I may keepe*
13. *thy words.* v. 101. *I haue not declined from thy*
14. *iudgements.* v. 102. *I haue sworne and determined to keepe the iudgements of thy iustice.* v. 106.
15. *I haue not erred from thy commaundements.* v.
16. 110. *Deliuer mee because I haue not forgotten thy*
17. *lavv.* v. 153. *I haue not declined from thy testi-*
18. *monies.* v. 157. *My soule hath kept thy testimonies.*
19. v. 167. *I haue kept thy commaundements and te-*
20. *stimonies.* v. 168. *Seeke thy seruant, for I haue*
21. *not forgotten thy commaundements.* v. 176. What now is it to say that there are no doess of Gods law, and it is impossible to keepe his commaundements, *but to sett his mouth against heauen.* Psalm. 72. and to giue God the lye.
Psalm. 98. I omit Moyses, Aaron, Samuel, Dauid, Io-
3. Reg. 14. sue, Zacharie, Elizabeth; and the Apostles,
Act. 13. who are said to haue kept Gods law, and
Iosue 11. 7. 15. some of them in al their hart. Only S. Paule
Luc. 1. I can not omit, because Bel artic. 4. pag.
Ioh 17. v. 6. 48. graunteth that he was most free, and
Contradict. 29. innocent from actual sinne, therefore surely he kept Gods law perfectly: for if he brake it he sinned actually.

Math. 19. 7. 17. 6. Thirdly Christ said, if thou wilt enter into life, keepe the commaundements. but entring into life is possible. Ergo: keeping the commaundements. Bel answereth, that Christ shewed not here, how one may attaine

taine to eternal life, but how perfectly they who looke to be iustified by good works must keepe the commaundements: *For Christ* (saith he) *being asked what good a man should doe to attaine eternal life, answered. If thou wilt haue eternal life by doing good works, then must thou keepe the commaundemẽts, but this is impossible* (saith Bel.) Here is most shameful abuse of Gods worde, and this sheweth Bel to haue *4 seared conscience.* For neither in the mans question, nor in Christs answer, is there any worde about what perfection of keeping Gods commaundements is requisit to come to heauen by this way, or that way: vz. by beleeuing, or by working, or by both. But only about the meane in general to come to heauen, what that was, which the man supposing to bee good, asked what good he should doe to come thither (which question of his is common either to faith, or works, or both; for al include doing good) And our Sauiour answered him, *If thou wilt enter* (not this way, nor that way, but absolutly) *into life, keepe the commaundements.* As Dauid demaunding absolutly, who shal dwel in Gods tabernacle? answereth him selfe. *He that walketh without spot, and worketh iustice.* And as him selfe otherwere absolutly saith. *Not euery one that said Lord, Lorde shal enter into*

Gods vvorde shamefully vvrested.

1. Timoth. 4 v. 3.

Psalm. 14. v. 1. 2.

Math. 7. v. 21.

the

the Kingdome of heauen, but he that doth the will of my father. And surely if this man asking simply, and of a desier to learne, as Caluin graunteth, had asked the way to heauen by an impossible meane (as Bel imagineth) Christ the author of truth, and who loued him, as S. Marke saith, would rather haue bidden him giue ouer that impossible way, and taught him the true, then how he should proceede in his erronious, and impossible way.

Caluin.

Marc. 10.

7. And though the man had asked Christ particularly, how he should come to heauen by good works, whence hath Bel, that his meanes to come to heauen is impossible? wil not Christ say in his last sentence. Come you blessed of my father, possesse the Kingdome prouided for you, from the constitution of the world: because I was Hungrie and you gaue mee to eat &c. Math. 25. v. 34. 35. as wel as he wil say, Goe you from mee you cursed into euerlasting fyer &c. because I was Hungry and you gaue mee not to eate. v. 41. Are not good workes accounted the meanes, and cause of comming to heauen, as the want of them the meane, and cause of going to hel. Yea doth not Bel say artic. 5. pag. 73. *that good workes are so necessary to attaine eternal life, as the vsual, ordinary, and vndoubted meanes* (marke

S. Math.

Contradict. 20.

(marke the worde) *by which God decreed from eternitie, freely for his owne name sake, to bring his elect to saluation.* And that *without them none haue bene, are, or shal be saued.* How are they now become an impossible meane to come to heauen? how did the man enquire of an impossible way to heauen, by good workes? what needs this challenger any aduersary, who thus ouerthroweth him selfe.

8. Fourthlie I proue the conclusion: because Christ saith, *my yoake is sweete, and my burthen light.* And S. Ihon saith, *his commaundements are not heauy.* Ergo they are possible. Bel answereth that these wordes are meant not in respect of vs, but of Christ, whose keeping the commaundements is imputed to vs: which S. Austin (saith he) meant when he wrote. *Then are al the commaundements reputed as done, when whatsoeuer is not done is forgiuen.*

Matth. 11. v. 30.

1. Ioh. 5. v. 3.

Bel p. 152.

S. Augustin. lib. 1. retra. c. 19. tom. 1.

9. But this is easily refuted. For S. Iohn spake in respect of vs assisted by Gods grace, when he said. *This is the law of God, that we keepe his commaundements, and his commaundements are not heauie.* He saith not (Christ) but (we) must keepe Gods commaundements, & to animate vs thereto, he addeth. that they are not heauy vz. to vs. And cap. 2. v. 2. he giueth vs a signe to try if we knowe

Bel either keepeth Gods commaundements, or knoweth not God.

know God: vz. if we keepe his commaundements, and v. 3. affirmeth, *that who keepeth not his cõmaundements knoweth not God*: wherfore either Bel keepeth the cõmandements, or he knoweth not God. Likewise Christ meant his yoake was sweete, and his burthen light to vs. For immediatly before he said Take vp my yoake vpon you, & learne &c. and you shal finde rest to your soules. For my yoake is sweet, and burthen light. To whom meaneth he it is light, but to vs, whom he biddeth take it vp? and whom he promiseth shal finde rest by it? or what reason had it bene for Christ, to exhorte vs to take vp his yoake, and tel vs we should finde rest by it, because it is sweet to himselfe?

Cap. 11. v. 29.

S. Augustin. Sup. to. 1.

As for S. Austin he said our defectuous keeping is counted a ful keeping, when the defect is pardoned; which is a farre different thing from saying. That Christs keeping is counted our keeping. And he meaneth that our keeping is defectuous, because we keepe not the commaundements *ad vnum apicem* (as he saith) to the last ioat or title: But through venial sinnes haue need to say. Forgiue vs our trespasses, which venial trespasses being pardoned, we are accounted to doe al Gods commaundements.

pag. 152.

10. An other answer Bel putteth in the margent, and in latine. That Christ meaneth

neth not of the yoake, and burthen of the law, when he calleth it ſweet, and eaſy, but of the Ghoſpel. That Chriſt meant of the law of the Ghoſpel, I graunt with S. Hierom dialog. 2. contr. Pelag, and is proued out of theſe wordes: *my yoake, my burthen.* But what is this to the purpoſe? Is Bel become a libertine, thincking as his father Luther did, that the tenne commaundements belong not to Chriſtians, or that the Ghoſpel commaundeth only faith? Did Chriſt come to diſſolue the law of nature, and to exempt vs from al law, but of beleeuing in him? If Bel be of this minde, let him vtter it plainly, and ſay Chriſt came not to fulfil the law, but to diſſolue it, that his faith eſtabliſheth not the law, but deſtroieth it. Or if he thinke that the law of the ghoſpel. Beſides the precepts of faith, includeth at leaſt the law of nature, let him confeſſe that the tenne commaundements, and al that God bindeth vs vnto, is not only poſſible, but eaſy, and ſweet, vz. to ſuch as loue God, as was Dauid when he ſaid, *I haue runne the way of thy cõmaundements, when thou didſt dilate my hart.* And *how ſweet are thy ſpeeches to my tawes, aboue hony to my mouth. The law of thie mouth is good to mee, aboue thouſands of golde and ſiluer.* For as S. Iohn ſaith 1. c. 5. v. 3. *this is the loue of God that wee keepe his commaun-*

S. Hierom.

Luther.

Math. 5. v. 19.

Rom. 3. v. 31.

Pſalm. 118. v. 32.

Omnia facilia ſunt charitati cui vni Chriſti ſarcina leuis eſt. Aug. de nat. & grat. c. 69. to. 7. ſee the places S. Iohn.

maundements. If Bel say that it is impossible to loue God as we ought to doe. This is reproued, because he loueth God as he should doe, who loueth him withal his hart, al his soule and power. But Iosue so loued God, of whome it is written. 4. Reg. 23. That he returned in al his harte, in al his soule, and al his strength. Likewise Dauid sought God in al his hart. Psalm. 118. and followed him in al his harte. 3. Reg. 14. And God hath some seruants, that walke before him in al their hart, with whome he keepeth his couenant, and mercy. 2. Paralip. 6. v. 14. And Deuter. 30. v. 6. God promiseth to circumcise the Iewes harts, that they might loue him in al their harts, and al their soule. And thus much for proofe out of scripture, now let vs goe to the Fathers.

Deuter. 6. 7. 5.

4. Reg. 23.

Dauid.

vers. 8.

Chap. II.

The possibility of keeping Gods commaundements proued out of Fathers and reason.

MANY holy Fathers I might alleadge for this verity, but I wil content my selfe with two only, whome Bel obiecteth against him selfe, and vndertaketh to answer. S. Hierom dialog. 1. contr. Pelag. we confesse (saith he) God hath giuen possible com-

S. Hierom. See S. Hierom in cap. 3. Mechæ.

commaundements, leſt he ſhould be author of iniuſtice. Beholde our concluſion both affirmed, and proued. And Dialog 2. I ſay a man may be without vice, which in greeke is called *catia*, but not *anamartyton*, that is without ſinne, which is as much as if he had ſaid. He can be without mortal, but not without venial ſinne. Againe: God hath not commaunded impoſſible things, but hath aſcended vp to ſuch height of patience, as for their great difficulty he may ſeeme to haue commaunded almoſt impoſſible things. Againe: we curſe their blaſphemie, who ſaie. That God hath commaunded to man any impoſſible thing. This Bel alleadgeth out of his 3. & fourth booke againſt Pelagians, whereas he wrote but one epiſtle, and three bookes or Dialogues againſt Pelagians. But it is in his epiſtle to Damaſus de expoſit. fidei. And therein S. Hierom curſeth this blaſphemy of Bel: *God hath giuen vs thoſe commaundements, which we can not poſſibly keepe.* Likewiſe S. Auſtin ſer. 61. de temp. God could not commaund any impoſſible thinge, becauſe he is iuſt. The ſame he repeateth lib. de nat. & grat. cap. 69. and lib. 2. de pen. mer. & remiſſ. and in pfal. 56. I can not doubt (ſaith he) that God hath neither commaunded any impoſſible thinge to man, nor that any thinge is im-

pag. 153.

pag. 149.

S. Auſtin. ſee S. Auſtin in Pſal. 56 tom 8. where he ſaith the Apoſtles did that charity, then the which none can be greater.

possible to God to helpe, wherby it may be done which he commaundeth.

2. For auoiding these authorities Bel deuiseth three shiftes. First, that Gods commaundements were possible to vs before Adams fal. Secondly, that they were possible to Christ, whose keeping them is accounted ours. Thirdly, that euen to vs they are now possible to be kept imperfectly, though not perfectly, which is (saith he) the doctrine of Aquinas: yet seeing that none of these shiftes would serue, he falleth to proue, that we may be iustly damned for not doing impossible matters; because Infants vnbaptized, are damned for original sinne, which saith he they could not possibly auoid. And in the margent calleth this a dilemma, which no Papist can auoid: But none of these shiftes wil suffice. For S. Hierome epist. ad Ctesiph. writeth, that the cõmaundements are possible to vs by Gods grace. And dialog. 1. cit. That they are so possible, as that Dauid we know (saith he) hath done them. If they be possible to vs, then not to Christ alone; and if Dauid did them, men after Adams sinne may doe them. And the reason which he, and S. Austin after him giueth of Gods iustice, conuinceth the same. For it is against his iustice, to commaund vs impossible things, as wel after

S. Thom. 2. 2. quæst. 44. art. 6.

ymtruth.

S. Hie m.

Adams

Adams sinne as before. Likewise S. Augustin after the Apostle saith, that the iustice of the law is fulfilled in vs. Ergo not in Christ alone.

S. Augustin. sermon. 64. de verb. Apostol. cap. 9. Rom. 8. v. 4.

3. As for the thirde shifte. S. Thomas saith indeed, that the precept of louing God withal our hart &c. can not be perfectly kept, but imperfectly, yet in a sense quite contrary to Bel. Perfectly saith he is the precept kept, when the very end intended by the commaunder is atchieued Imperfectly, when albeit the end be not attained, yet the way vnto it is not left. As a souldier fighting, and ouercomming, perfectly fulfilleth the commaund of his captaine, bidding him fight. And an other fighting, and doing nothing against the duety of a souldier, but not ouercomming, fulfilleth it, but imperfectlie. Whereby we see plainly, that though S. Thomas deny, that the end, (vz to bee wholy vnited to God) for which he gaue that precept of loue, be not possible in this life, yet he graunteth that we may so fight, or labour for the attaining it, as wee doe nothing against the order commaunded by God, or the duety of a spiritual souldier. Which is indeed substantially to keepe the precepts, though S. Thomas in respect of keeping them, and also attayning the end, for which they were made, cal it imperfect

keeping. For seeing God commaundeth not the end, but only intendeth it (as S. Thomas saith) if the order and meanes commaunded be fulfilled, then surely the commaundement is fulfilled, though the end of the commaunder, which is only intended, not commaunded be not attayned.

4. And as for Bels dilemma it is easily answered, and therefore might haue bene better lefte out (as himselfe writeth in the margent) For though Infants after they haue sinned, and eaten the aple in Adam, cannot auoide the guilt thereof, but must needs contract it by origin from Adam. As a man after he hath committed adultery can not but contract the guilt of adultery: Yet becaufe as Infants sinned in Adam, so they might haue not sinned in him, and so haue auoided the guilt of sinne, falsly doth Bel say they could not possibly auoide it. And I wonder why hauing taught before, that concupiscence (which is the effect of original sinne) is voluntary, he will now say that Infants could not possibly auoide original sinne. But it is his custome to gainsay himselfe.

Bel pag. 51. art. 4.

Contradict. 21.

Reason. 5. By reason also it may be proued, that Gods precepts are possible. For besides, that if the law were impossible, sinne might be inuoluntary. I aske to whom Gods commaun-

maundements are impoſſible? To man alone? and that is not the queſtion nor denyed of any Catholique: or to man with Gods grace? and that is contrary to S. Paule ſaying *I can doe al things in him that ſtrengtheneth mee*: and iniurious to Gods grace, making it impotent, which S. Ihon maketh ſo potent as he auoucheth, that he can not ſinne, in whom it remayneth 1. Ioh. 3. v. 9. why did God ſay *ſufficit tibi gratia mea*: *my grace ſufficeth thee* 2. Corinth 12. if his grace ſuffice not. Likewiſe if God commaunded impoſſible things, he ſhould be the Author of iniuſtice, or vniuſt; as affirme S. Hierom dialog. 1. contr. Pelag. and S. Auſtin de nat. & grat. cap. 69. and ſerm. 61. de temp. For it is an vniuſt law which is impoſſible, and to punish breakers were againſt right, and equity. As Bel himſelfe would graunt if vpon paine of death he were bid to flie to heauen, and executed if he did not. Wherfore S. Hierom epiſt. ad Cteſiphont: writhus. we pronounce the commaunder vniuſt, whiles we complaine, that the very Author of equity, hath commaunded impoſſible things. And Simon Magus (ſaith Vincent. Lirinen.) made God Author of ſinne, in affirming vs to ſinne of neceſſity. Now let vs ſee Bels proofes to the contrary.

S Paul Philip. 4 verſ. 13

S. Iohn.

S. Paul. 1. 9.

S. Hieron.

Vincent. Lirin.

CHAP. III.

Bels arguments out of Scripture against the possibility of keeping Gods commaundements answvered.

BEL proueth Gods commaundements to be impossible First, out of S. Iames saying. *We al offend in many things.* Answer. S. Iames meaneth of venial sinnes, as idle words are, whereof he speaketh in the same verse. And though Bel replie, that he hath already proued, that euery sinne is mortal in it owne nature, yet neither is that true, as before is shewed, nether though it were, could it disproue my answer. For it sufficeth (which Bel denyeth not) that there indeed are venial sinnes (whether they be such by their owne nature, or by Gods mercy) in the which iust men may offend, and not breake Gods law deadly.

Iacob. 3. v. 2.

Si quis in verbo non offendit, hic perfectus est vitæ. v. 2.

Art. 6. cap. 6.

Bel art. 6. *pag.* 81.

pag. 144. 2. Next he alleadgeth S. Paules wordes Galath. 3. vers. 10. *Cursed be euery one that shal not abide in al things that are written in the booke of the law to doe them.* what can hence be inferred to Bels purpose I see not, except that al men are cursed, or els freed from al lawes of God, and true libertines. But in truth it maketh more against him, then for him. For S. Paules intention was to proue,

to proue, that faith in Christ was to iustification, and that the works of the bare law without faith were not sufficient. And therefore hauing proued by Abrahams example, that faith doth concurre to iustificatiō, in the tenth verse proueth, that workes of the bare law suffice not. For whosoeuer (saith he) are of the workes of the law (vz. without faith) are vnder curse. For it is written accursed be &c. Because such as want faith, can not abide in al things of the law, and consequently are vnder curse. But what maketh this against those who haue faith and grace. Such can doe al Gods wil with Dauid: act. 13. Such erre not from Gods commaundements: Psal. 118. Such can fulfil al things, and let not passe one worde of al Gods commaundements with Iosue. cap. 11. Such are doers of the law and iustifyed. Rom. 2. v. 12. 14. finally such because the seed of God is in them neither sinne, nor can sinne. 1. Ioh. 3. vers. 9. and consequently auoyd the foresaid curse. Neither doe their venial sinns incurre the curse: for it is pronounced only against heynous crimes, namely Idolatry, incest, murder, and the like, as is euident by the 27. of Deuter. from whence the Apostle reciteth the curse But Bel who confesseth him selfe to incurre the crime accursed by the law, must needs

Act. vnf. 22. *Psalm.* *Iosue.* *S. Paul.* *S. Iohn.* *Deut.*

confesse him selfe to be vnder that curse, or say, that he is not bound to Gods lawes made against Idolatrie, Incest, murder, and the like.

pag. 144. 3. The like text he bringeth out of S. Iames. 2 v. 10 *Whosoeuer shal keepe the whole law, and offended in one is made guilty of al.* This place also maketh rather against Bel. For it supposeth that al the law may be kept, as wel one point as the whole; and only teacheth, that the keeping of the whole law wil not saue, if one point thereof be deadly broken. But this is nothing against Gods children, who as long as his seed abideth in them sinne not. Ioh. 3. v. 9. nor offend deadly in one point, but abide both in the whole law, and euery pointe thereof.

S. Ioh.

4. Diuers other places Bel alleadgeth to proue that al men are sinners, and that the iust doe sinne, which no Catholique denyeth, as Bel might learne out of the Tridentine Councel. But how followeth it thereof, that the Iust whiles they are Iust sinne deadly, or cannot auoyd al deadly sinne This is the marque which Bel should shoot at, and hoped in the beginning of this article to hit the naile on the head, but as S. Hierom said to a Luciferian: whiles he followeth his vaine of gainsaying, he hath

Concil. Trident. sess. 6. cap. 11.

pag. 143.

S. Hierom. dialog. cont. Lucifer.

mist

miſt the queſtion, as ſome rather praters then ſpeakers vſe to doe; who not knowing to diſpute yet ceaſe not to quarrel.

CHAP. IIII.

Bels arguments out of Fathers againſt the poſsibility of keeping Gods commaundements anſwered.

FIRST, out of S. Auſtin he alleadgeth, that God commaunded vs to loue him with al our hart, ſoule, and mynde, and thereby left no part of our life vacant to take fruition of any other thinge. But S. Auſtin in theſe words meant nothing els, but that wee muſt loue nothing as our end, and for it ſelfe but Gods for ſo he vſeth the worde fruition, and therfore addeth which Bel left forth. *But what other thing commeth to our mynde to be loued, let it be carried thither, whither the whole current of loue runneth.* *pag.* 145. S. Auguſtin. lib. 1. de doctrin. Chriſt. c. 22. 10. 3.

2. Other words he citeth out of lib. de perfect. iuſti. ratiocin. 16. but they are in 17. cap. 8. where S. Auſtin writeth. That as long as there is any thing of carnal concupiſcence, which may be bridled by refrayning, God is not loued *(omnimodo)* altogether with al the ſoule. And yet though none in this life haue that perfection it is commaunded, becauſe it is not wel runne, if it *pag.* 149.

if it be not knowne whither to runne. Answer. What S. Austins meaning is herein himselfe explicateth, saying, that the precept of louing God withal our soule is not *omnimodo* altogether fulfilled whilst we haue inordinate motions. He denyeth not substantial fulfilling which auoideth sinne (yea lib. de spir. & liter. cap. vlt. affirmeth, that though wee did not loue God withal our harts, and soule, so as we had no motions of lust: yet if wee did not obey them, we need not to aske God forgiuenes) but only denyeth *omnimodam impletionem*, which in the place cited he called most supereminent perfection of louing God, and saith not it belongeth to this, but to the next life, vz. to bee perfectly perfourmed. Wherfore when he saith such perfection is commaunded in this life, he meaneth not that it is commaunded as a thing which we are bound to perfourme, but only as an end to which we should runne. *For though* (saith he) *no man perfourme it, yet We runne not wel, if We knovv not vvhither to runne, and hovv should We knovv if it vvere shevved by no precept.*

S. Augustin. tom. 3.

De perfect. instit. loc. sit.

3. Next he citeth S. Thomas only because he vseth the words perfectly, and imfectly. But how contrary to Bels meaning hath bene before explicated, which reproueth his vntruth in affirming himselfe to teach

pag. 147.

S. Thomas 2. 2 q. 44. art. 6.

teach the selfe same doctrine with Aquinas. What hath bene said to S. Austin, and S. Thomas is to be applied to S. Bernarde, when he saith in the like sort, that the precept of louing God can not be fulfilled in this life. And that God in commaunding impossible things made not men preuaricators, but humble. For beside that S. Bernard, as himselfe, speaketh this only, if the precept of loue be vnderstood of affectual charity, or charity in worke, and graunteth that so it is fulfilled, if it be perfectly obserued, as (said he a litle before) it may be in this life by Gods grace. Besides this I say, immediatly before the words which Bel cyteth, he graunteth, that *initium perfectumque* the beginning and perfection of charity may be experienced by Gods grace in this life. If perfection be had, surely the precept is fulfilled. For (as himselfe saith sone after) doest thou not thincke is sufficient to the fulfilling the precept of louing thie neighbour, if thou obserue it perfectly. And Bel pag. 151. graunteth, that who perfectly obserueth the law shal be iustifyed.

S. Bernard. hom. 50. in Cant.

4. And though he differ, or (as he speaketh) defend the consummation of charity to the next life, and therefore accoumpt the precept of charity impossible, as far forth as it imbraceth the consummation, yet he mea-

meaneth not, that it imbraceth consummation as a thinge needful to be performed, which (he saith) *shalbe our reward in heauen*, but as the end to which men ought to endeuour, *Vt scirent* (saith he) *ad quem iustitiæ finem pro viribus niti oporteret*, that they might know to what end of iustice they ought to endeuour withal their power. Behoulde he saith not, that we ought to attaine to the said end, but to endeuour al that we can; and therefore God in commaunding that end in such sort as he doth, maketh men no sinners, thongh they attaine not to it.

pag. 150. 5. After these fathers he bringeth two reasons The one out of our Lords prayer, where we are taught to aske forgiuenes, But where pardon is demaunded, ths law is not exactly obserued. The other is out of our daily confessions, where we acknowledge our fault, and most great fault. Answer; As the petition of forgiuing our sinns, doth enidently conuince, that we doe not so exactly keep the law, as we neuer swarue from it: So the other petition of doing Gods wil in earth as it is in heauen, euidenrly conuinceth, that we can doe it without deadly breaking it. As for our confession, we doe not confesse that our daylie offences are most great faults, but daily confesse our most great fault, whether it were done

done then or before. Beſides that humble and penitent mindes accompt themſelues greateſt ſinners, and their offences greateſt faults. So S. Paul 1. Timoth 1. v. 15 accounted himſelfe the *chiefeſt ſinner*. Yea *good ſoules* (as S. Gregory ſaith) *acknowledge ſinne where none is*, and with Iob, feare al their works. And as the ſame holy Doctour noteth, the reprobate accompt great ſinns little, and the elect little ſinns great, and which before they thought were light, ſtraight they abhor as heauy and deadly. And S. Hierom obſerueth, that *it increaſeth paines to take heed of little* (ſinnes) *as if they were great. For with ſo much the more facility we abſtaine from any ſinne, by how much more we feare it.*

S. Paul.

S. Gregor. epiſt. ad Auguſt. Cant. cap. 10. *Iob cap. 9.* S. Gregor. in Pſalm. 4. Panitent.

S. Hieron. epiſt. ad Celant.

6. And hence Bel may ſee, why we in dayly confeſſions confeſſe our moſt great fault, which I would God he would imitate, and both confeſſe, and amend his heynous fault of ſinning againſt the holy Ghoſt, and impugning the Catholique Church, which he knoweth to be Gods Church. Otherwiſe let him aſſure himſelfe, that ſhame wil be his end in this life, and endles punishment his reward in the next. Wel he may beat againſt this rocke, but like the waues, he shal without hurting it, beat himſelfe in pieces, and be reſolued into froth and foame. Let him write books, let him ſpend himſelfe, and

and make nets with the Spider of his owne guts, they wil proue only ſpider webbes, apt to cath or holde none, but ſuch as like inconſtant and fleshly flyes are carrayed about with euery mynde of new doctrine, and following their carnal appetites, and licentiouſnes, ſeaze vpon fleshly baite. And ſo Bel though he could become an other God Bel, he should but be Beel zebub the God of flies. *Be myndful therfore* (Bel) *from whence thou art fallen, and do penance.* Apocalip. 2.

FINIS.

All praiſe to Almightie God.

Of the things cõteined in this booke vvherin a ſignifyeth article. c. chapter and parag. paragraph.

ADDITION of one tradition as much forbidden as of many ar. 7. c. 2. parag. 1.

Addition to Scripture, which forbidden, which not ar. 7. c. 2. pareg.

Anomia how it may ſignify tranſgreſſion of the law ar. 6. c. 2. parag. 2.

Antichriſts true hinderance meant by S. Paul ar. 1. c. 9. parag. 4.

Antichriſts hinderance not taken away in Pipius tyme a. 1. c. 9. parag. 3.

Angles falſly charged by Bel art. 5. c. 5. parag. 6.

S. Antonin falſly charged by Bel art 3. c. 1. parag. 1. and 13.

Apoſtataes may teach true doctrine art. 7. c. 10 parag. 9.

Apoſtles Creed conſerued by Tradition art. 7. c. 9. parag. 4.

S. Athanaſius explicated, and his reuerence of Traditions art. 7. c. 4. parag 9.

S. Auſtin as a Chriſtian ſaid he wold not beleeue the Ghoſpel without the Church art. 7. c. 9. parag. 22.

S. Au-

Saint Austin wold not beleeue Maniche though he had had expresse Scripture art. 7. c. 9. parag. 24.

S. Austin how he compared Concupiscence with blindnes of hart. art. 4. c. 3. parag. 1.

S. Austins opinion of habitual Concupiscence, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 18.

S. Austins opinió of inuoluntary motions, art. 4. c 1. parag 13.

S. Austin preuented Bels obiections, a r. 4. c. 1. parag. 18.

S. Austin how he meant that we loue not God altogether art. 8. c 4 parag. 2.

S. Austin how he called our keeping the commaundements defectuous. art. 8. c. 1. parag. 9.

S. Austins reuerence and role to know Traditions. art. 7. c. 4 parag 3.

S. Austin said the Apostles eat bread our lord. art. 2. c. 5. parag. 8.

S. Austin said Iudas eat our price. art. 2. c 5. paragr. 8.

S. Austin why he said Iudas eat bread of our lord. art. 2 c. 5 parag 8.

S. Austin wold not credit the Scripture if the Catholiques were discredited. art. 7. c. 9. parag. 22.

S. Austin and S. Prosper Papists out of Bel. art. 2. c. 4. parag. 13.

S. Basil

B.

S. Basil explicated, and his reuerence of Traditions. art. 7. c. 4 parag. 13.
S. Bede a Papist. art. 4. c. 4. parag. 4.
Bellarmins doctrin of merit the common doctrin of Catholiques. a. 5. c. 6 parag. 9.
Beleefe in al points not prescribed at once. art. 7. c. 2. parag. 7.
Bel a right Apostata from Preisthood. art. 1. c. 9. parag. 31.
Bel against Caluin. art. 5. c. 2. parag. 3.
Bel admitteth Tradition. a. 7. c. 9 parag. 811.
Bels answer about Tradition of the bible refuted. art. 7. c. 9. parag. 5.
Bel admitteth venial sinns. art. 6. c. 1. parag. 1.
Bels beleefe of venial sinne beside Gods booke. art. 6. c. 1. parag. 2.
Bel a Papist by his owne iudgement. art. 4. c. 1. parag. 10.
Bel against al Gods Church which liued in the first 200. years. art. 7. c. 10. parag. 2.
Bel alleadgeth authority against him selfe. a. 7. c. 10. parag. 5.
Bel answereth not to the purpose. art. 7. c. 9. parag. 7.
Bels argument returned vpon him self. art. 2. c 6. parag. 3.
Bels blasphemy against God. art. 8 c. 2. parag. 1. against his Church. a. 7. c. 9. par. 5. against iustification. a. 4. c. 2. parag. 1.

Bels blasphemy accursed by S. Hierom, art. 8 c. 2. parag. 1.
Bels blindnes discouered, art. 1. c. 9. parag 6.
Bel bound to recant, art. 3. c 1. parag 13 a. 2. c. 5. parag 9
Bels buckler the Princes sword, art. 1. c 1. parag. 10.
Bels challeng is Bellarmins obiections, art. 4 c. 3 parag. 2.
Bels complaint against Catholiques, art. 5. c 1 parag. 1
Bel condemneth as blasphemy in the Pope which he iudgeth treason to deny to Princes art. 1. c. 9. parag. 23
Bels contradictions, art. 1. c. 5. parag 4. c. 8. parag 5 a. 2. c 2. parag. 4. a. 4 c 1. parag 12. 13. c. 2. parag. 6 art. 5. c. 3 parag. 3. c. 5. parag. 7 art. 7. c. 7 parag. 19 art. 8. c. 1. parag 5 7. c. 2. par. 4.
Bel corrupted Scripture, art. 7. c. 2. parag. 8 c. 7. parag. 3. 12. corrupteth S. Ambros, art. 7 c. 4. parag. 12.
Bel cursed of S. Paul by his owne iudgement, art. 7 c. 9 parag 8.
Bel discredited him selfe, art. 1. chap. 9. parag. 10.
Bels dissimulation, art. 1. c. 1. parag. 1 a 2. c 1 par. 5 art. 3. c. 1 parag. 2.
Bel denyeth deuine faith to proceed from mans teaching, art. 7. c 9 parag 20.

Bel dis-

XUM

Bel disproueth him self, art. 5. c. 6. parag. 6. art. 4. c. 1. parag. 17.
Bel exceedeth Pelagius, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 1.
Bels faith grownded vpon reason, art. 2. c. 1. parag 7.
Bel slenderly grownded in faith, art. 2. c. 5. parag. 6.
Bels false translation, art. 2. c. 3. parag. 8. c. 4. parag. 13 a. 4 c. 2. parag. 4. 7. 10. c. 3. parag. 4. c. 6. par. 3 4. 7. 8. art. 7. c. 1. parag. 2. c. 9. parag. 22. c. 12. parag. 3.
Bel a foolish phisitian, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 17.
Bels godly sense an vngodly shift, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 2.
Bels godly keeping Gods commaundements an vngodly breaking of them, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 1.
Bel keepeth Gods commaundements ot knoweth him not, art. 8 c. 1. parag 9.
Bels ignorance in history, art. 1. c. 9. par. 1.
Bels ignorance in latin, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 10. art. 7. c. 9. par. 19 art. 2. c. 4 parag. 13.
Bels ignorance in logik, art. 2. c. 6 par. 2. 4.
Bels ignorance in preaching, a. 7. c 7. par. 10.
Bel impugneth errors, histories & opinions in steed of Traditions, a. 7. c. 10. par. 7. 10.
Bel impugneth an opinion of Protestants and Canonists as a point of Popery, art. 3. c. 1. parag. 2.
Bel impugneth his owne slanders as a point

of Popery. art. 1. c. 1. parag. 5.
Bel impugneth a ſchool point as a point of Popery. a. 2. c. 1. parag. 6. a. 5. c. 2. parag. 4.
Bels ladder of lying, art. 2. c. 5. parag. 7.
Bel maketh Scripture like a neck verſe, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 1.
Bels malice and folly in reprehending the Rhemiſts, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 3.
Bel noteth S. Auſtin what is quite againſt him ſelf, art. 2. c. 5. parag. 6.
Bel ouerthroweth at once what he intēded to proue in al the Article, a. 4. c. 13. parag. 8.
Bel preferreth reaſon in matter of faith before authority, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 9.
Bels queſtion like to that of the Capharnaits, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 11.
Bel recanting, art. 5. c. 6. parag. 8.
Bel ſeemeth a Libertin, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 10.
Bels ſhifts to auoid authority, a. 8. c. 2. par. 2.
Bels vain boaſt, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 9.
Bels vain proteſtation, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 4.
Bel curſed by the law or keeperh it, art. 8. c. 3. parag. 2.
Bels vntruths whereof diners are ſlanderous, a. 1. c. 1. parag. 1. c. 7. par. 4. c. 9. parag. 28. 33. a. 2. c. 4. par. 14. c. 6. par. 8. a. 3. c. 1. par. 1. 10. 13. a. 4. c. 1. parag. 9. c. 2. par. 1. 4. 5. 6. a. 5. c. 5. par. 7. 9. 10. c. 6. par. 1. 2. 4. 5. 9. 8. 6. c. 2. par. 9. a. 7. c. 3. par. 7. c. 4. parag. 6. 8. c. 5. par. 1. 4. 5. 8. c. 7. par. 4. 18. 19. c. 9. parag. 22.

c.10.parag.6.11. c.12.parag.1.2.3. c.13.par. 8. c.14.par.1.4. a.8.c.2.par.2.
Bel will not haue vs heare Scripture read in Churches, art.7.c.7.parag.16.
Bel will examin Scriptures, art.7.c.9.par.11.
Bel wresteth Scripture, art.8.c.1.parag.6.
Berengarius dyed a Catholik, a.2.c.5.par.1.
Berhæans example explicated & what they examined, art.7.c.11.parag.4.
S. Bernards meaning about possibility of loving God, art. 8.c.4.parag.3.4.
S. Bernards meaning about merit, art. 5. c. 5. parag. 9.
Byble alone canonical Scripture but not alone Canonical, art.7.c.11.parag.3.
Byble conserued and beleeued to be Gods word by Tradition, art.7.c.9.parag.4.
Bilson attributing to Kings participation of Gods name, power, honor & homage, art.1.c.7.parag.7.
Bishops oath to the Pope made with consent of al Catholik Princes, a.7.c.14.par.2.
Bishops oath to the Pope lawful, and antient, art.7.c.14.parag.2.
Bishops sweare no rebellion. a.7.c.14.par.3.
Britanny conuerted first to Popery, art. 7. c.10.parag.2.

C.

CAtholiques and Protestants true difference in whome the supremacy is,

art. 1. c. 2. parag. 3.
Catholiks neuer attributed to the Pope power proper to God, art. 1. chap. 7. parag. 5.
Catholiks faith of the Eucharist grownded vpon Scripture and Fathers, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 7. 8.
Catholique Church like a prudent nurse, art. 7. c. 7 parag. 17.
Catholiques and Protestants opinion about deposition of Princes compared, art. 1. c. 3. parag. 8.
Catholiques falsly charged where Protestants might better, art. 7. c. 1 par. 4.
Catholiques falsly charged about disobedience to euil Kings, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 34.
Catholiques how they think the commandements possible, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 2.
Catholiques haue Tradition euen from S. Peter, art 7. c. 9 parag. 10.
Catholiques vse Scripture in vulgare tong, art. 7. c. 8 parag. 4.
Caluin attributeth deuine power to Magistrats, art. 1. c. 7. parag. 3.
Caluin confesseth S. Austin to thinke inuoluntary concupiscence no true sinne, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 18.
Caluin accounteth the sacrifice of the crosse insufficient, art. 2. c. 4. parag. 5.
Caluin father of the new Arrians, art. 7. c. 1. pa-

XUM

1. parag. 6.
Caluins ſmale account of Gods word when it is againſt him, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 10.
Caluiniſts become Arrians, and Mahumetans, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 5.
Ceremonial law perfectly preſcribed to the Iewes, art. 7 c. 2 parag 5 6.
Charles made Emperor without conſent of Eaſtern Emperors, art. 1. chap. 9. paragr 19
Choiſe propounded to Proteſtants about Emperors made by Popes, art. 1. c. 6. parag. 3 an other about Traditions, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 3. about Luther, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 16.
Chriſts body to be organical in the ſacrament no point of faith, a. 2. c 1. parag. 6.
Chriſts body in his nativity in a litle roome art. 2. c. 1. parag 12.
Chriſts body in one place naturally in many ſacramentally, art. 2. c. 2. parag. 6.
Chriſts body broken in a ſigne, art. 2. c. 5. parag. 3.
Chriſts body broken in a ſigne which really conteineth it. art. 2 c. 5. parag. 4.
Chriſts blood is a teſtament, a 2. c. 3 par. 7.
Chriſts blood how powred out, or shed at his ſupper. art 2. c. 4. parag 8.
Chriſt carryed him ſelf literally or really in his owne hands, art. 2. c. 4 parag 1.

Christ nether killed nor dyeth at Masse, art. 2. c. 3. parag. 6.
Christ offered sacrifice at his last supper, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 2.
Christs sacrifice at his last supper not imperfect nor at his passion needles, art. 2. c. 4. parag. 4.
Christ sacramental being, a representation of his natural being, a. 2. c. 4. parag. 1.
Christias bound to obey as wel the present as the primatiue Church, a. 7. c. 13. par 2.
S. Chrisostom about Traditions explicated, art. 7. c. 4. parag. 11.
S. Chrisostom about reading Scripture explicated, and opposit therein to Protestants, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 8.
S. Chrisostom how he meãt that Christ bid vs not immitate his fast, a. 7. c. 10. par. 6.
S. Chrisostom giueth not people liberty to expound Scriptures contrary to their Pastors, a. 7. c. 7. parag. 8.
Churches authority not mere humaine, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 21.
Churches authority concurreth to deuine faith, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 20.
Churches authority both first brought and continued S. Austin in beleefe of the Ghospel, art. 7. c 9. parag. 19.
Church within 200. years after Christ highly esteemed Traditions, a. 7. c. 10. parag. 2.

Church

Church may iustly abridg any liberty giuen by S: Chisostom, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 8.
Church of late daies as infallible witnes of Gods truth as the primatiue, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 5. 6.
Church present only infallible external witnes of Scripture, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 7.
Church beleeueth not the old testament for any tradition of Iewes, art. 7. c. 9. par. 10.
Church of the east acknowledgeth the Popes primacy, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 6.
S. Cyprian wherin he erred, a. 7. c. 4. par. 6 7.
S. Cyprian reiected one only Tradition, art. 7. c. 4. parag. 7.
S. Cyprian opposit to Bel about Traditions in most things, art. 7. c. 4. parag. 7.
Commandement may be substantially kept by Gods grace, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 1.
Commaundements truly kept of the man Math. 19. art. 8. c. 1. parag. 4.
Commaundements can not be truly kept and deadly broken, art 8 c. 1. parag. 2.
Communion book made out of the Missal and Portesse, art. 2. c. 6. parag. 10.
Councels acknowledge the Popes primacy, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 6.
Councels determination not needles, art. 7. c. 14. parag. 4.
Councels in our daies as certain as before tyme, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 1.

Councels

Councels in some sort like to Parlament, art. 7.c. 13. parag. 4.
In Confiteor why we say our great fault, art.8.c 4 parag. 5.
Concupiscence diuersly named, art. 4. c. 1, parag. 3.
Concupiscence how commanded not to be at al according to S. Austin, art.8...4.parag. 2. art.2.c.3.parag 6.
Concupiscence actual though inuoluntary is euil, art 4.c.1.parag 4.
Concupiscence actual inuoluntary no formal sinne, art.4.c.1.parag 7.
Concupiscence actual if voluntary is formal sinne, art.4 c.1.parag.5.
Concupiscence if neuer inuoluntary nothing is inuoluntary, art 4.c 1 parag 10.
Concupiscence habitual both positiue and priuatiue euil, art. 4 c.1.parag.1.
Concupiscence habitual in the not regenerate materially original sinne, art. 4 c. 1. parag. 2.
Concupiscence habitual in the regenerate no formal sinne, art.4.c.1.parag.14.
Concupiscence how it need forgiuenes, a.. 4 c.3 parag.3.
Concupiscence habitual and actual in whomsoeuer may be called sinne, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 6.
Concupiscence indirectly voluntary known by the

by the law to be true ſinne, art. 4. c. 3. parag. 9.
Concupiſcence directly voluntary not executed, hardly knowne to be ſinne without the law, art. 4. c. 2. parag. 9.
Condigne merit no point of faith, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 4.
Condigne merit proued, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 4. 6. 7.
Condigne merit what it requireth, art. 5. c. 2. parag. 7.
Condigne merit of man explicated by the labors of a ſlaue, art. 5. c. 6. parag. 2.
Condigne merit denyed by ſome Catholiques, but differently from Proteſtants, art. 5. c. 6. parag. 10.
Condigne merit of man not abſolute but conditional, art. 5. c. 3 parag 5.
Condigne merit of man not arithmetically equal, but proportionate to the reward, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 5.
Condigne merit riſeth not merely of Gods acceptance, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 5.
Condignity riſeth partly of our work, as it is the fruit of the holy Ghoſt, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 5.
Condigne merit honorable to God and to Chriſts merits, art. 5. c. 3. parag. 7. 8.
Cõdigne merit only true merit, art. 5 c. 3. par. 6.
Coniugal copulatiõ may be meritorious, & giue

giue grace, art. 3. c. 1. parag. 9.
Copulation rather Miniſterish then Popish art. 5. c. 1. parag. 7.
Conſciences timorous feare litle ſinnes as great, art. 8. c. 4. parag. 5.
Conſtantins departure from Rome no ſtep to the Popes primacy, art. 1. c. 8. parag. 3.
Conſtantin honored the Pope, a. 1. c. 6 par. 6.
Conſtantins humility in the Nicen Councel, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 5.
Conſumption may be without killing, art. 2. c. 3. parag. 6.
Curſe of the law pronounced only againſt heynous crymes, art. 8. c. 3. parag. 2.

D.

DAnger in not crediting Romane Traditions, art. 7 c. 10. parag. 11.
Dealing with heretiks we muſt haue other help beſide Scripture, and why, art. 7. c. 5. parag. 1. 2.
Denyal of the cõmandements to be poſſible iniurious to Gods grace, a. 8. c. 2. par. 4.
Depoſition of Princes firſt decreed by S. Gregory the great, art. 2. c. 5. parag. 4.
Difference of the doctrin in pulpit, and ſchoole, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 9.
Dilemma about the Popes ſuperiority ouer Emperors, art 1. c. 6. parag. 3.
Dilemma for Bel, art. 1 c. 9. parag. 22.
Diſagrement of Authors about tyme and circum-

circumſtances diſproueth not the fact, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 17.
Diſagreement of ſchool men far different from that of Proteſtants, a. 4. c. 4. par. 7.
Differences betwene S. Chriſoſtom & Proteſtants about reading Scripture, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 5.

E.

EAſt Empire when it began to decay, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 1.
Eckins foyled Luther, art. 5. c. 6. parag. 4.
Emperors called the Popes arbitrement celeſtial, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 28.
Emperors haue confeſſed the Popes ſuperiority ouer them, art. 1. c. 6. parag. 4.
Emperors ſubiect to Biſhops according to S. Gregory Nazianz. art. 7. c 13 parag. 5.
Emperors ſubiect to the ſea of Rome, according to S. Gregory the great, a. 1. c. 5. par. 2.
Emperors who haue humbled them ſelfs to Popes, named, art. 1. c. 6. parag. 6. 7.
Emperors of the Eaſt why offended with Charles creation, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 19.
England named feaſts of the Maſſe, art. 2. c. 3. parag. 5.
English bybles al hitherto il tranſlated, art. 7. c. 8. parag. 1.
English bybles conteine vntrue and ſeditions notes, art. 1. c. 3. parag. 7.
S. Epiphanius & S. Cyril explicated, their reuerен-

reuerence of Traditions, art. 7. chap. 4. parag. 10.
Epistles of S. Peter, S. Ihon, S. Iames, and S. Iude, written against solifidian iustice, art. 7. c. 6. parag. 2.
Eternal life lower waies grace, and yet true reward, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 2.
Eternal life may signify iustification, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 6.

F.

FAith can not discerne any thing clearly art. 7. c. 9. parag. 15.
Faith in al points not actually in Scripture, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 9.
Faith in al points not sufficiently, and immediatly proued by Scripture, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 10.
Faith in al points vertually in Scripture two waies, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 7.
Faith why not so perfectly prescribed to Iewes as ceremonies, art. 7. c. 2 parag. 7.
Faith in no point may be denyed of any, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 1.
Faith in diuers points need not be actually beleeued of many, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 1.
Fathers proued consubstantiality by Tradition, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 2.
Fale of the western Empire no step to the Popes primacy, art. 1 c. 8. parag. 4.
Figure or represent one thinge may it selfe, art.

art.2.c.6.parag.2.
Figure what inferior to the thinge figured what not, art.2.c.6.parag.1.
Figuratiue expolition vſual shift of heretiks, art 2.c.1.parag 9.10.
First Protestants haunted of Diuels, art.2. c. 1. per tot.
Formal obiect of faith, art. 7. chap. 9. parag. 24.

G.

GOds precepts both possible and easy to them that loue him, art.8.c.1.paragr. 10.
God how he can put a great body into a litle, how not, art.2.c.1 parag 13.14 15.16.
God not imputing sinne taketh it away, art. 4.c.3 parag.4.
Gods worde by it selfe can not be discerned as easely as light, art.7 c.9.parag.13
Gods worde how an explication of the two precepts of loue, art.7.c.1.parag.8
Gods worde why called a light & lanthern, art.7.c.9.parag.17.
Good gotten of Protestants by English bibles, art 7.c.8 parag.1.
Good workes are condigne merit, art.5. c. 1. parag. 2. 4.
Good workes follow not euery parson iustifyed, art.5 c.2.parag.1.
Good workes giue no security of saluation, art. 5.

art. 5. c. 2. parag. 3.
Good works possible, and vsual meane to saluation, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 7.
Gods worde not knowne at first to Samuel Gedeon Manue, S. Peter, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 13.
Ghospel a supply of the ould testament, art. 7. c. 2. parag. 3.
S. Gregory a saint with Luther and Caluin, a Papist with Bel, art. 1. c. 5. parag. 5.
S. Gregory accounted Kinges subiect to him, and how he called the Emperour lord, art. 1. c. 5. parag. 2. 3.
S. Gregory first decreed deposition of Princes, art. 1. c. 5. parag. 4.
S. Gregory said Masse in honour of Martyrs, art 1. c. 5. parag. 5.
S. Gregory Nazianz. discommended common peoples reading Scripture, art. 7. c. 7. parag 19.
Greater authority may be contested by lesser, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 23.

H.

HEretiks shift is to expound Scripturs figuratiuely, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 9.
Heretiks reiect Traditions, art. 7. c. 4. parag 14.
S. Hieroms high esteeme of the Popes definition, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 1.
S. Hierom whome and how he exhorteth to read

XUM

to read Scripture, art.7.c.7.parag.17.
Hatred of Masse whence it first rose, art. 2. c.3. parag. 3.

I.

S. Iames epistle contemned by Luther, art. 7.c.9 parag.16.
S. Iames c. 2. v. 2. meaneth of venial sinns, art.8.c.3.parag.1.
Iewes added signes and words to the law according to Protestants, a.7. c. 2. par. 2.
Ignorance of it selfe no holines, art. 7.c. 7. parag. 18.
Ignorance what better then what knowledge, art.7.c.7.parag.18.
Ignorance of Scripture not the whole cause of the Sadduces error, a. 7.c.11.par. 3.
S. Ihon what he bid vs try, a.7.c.11.parag.5.
S. Ihon c. 20. v. 30. meaneth of miracles, art.7.c.3.parag.
S. Ihon ep. 1. c. 3. v. 4. meaneth of mortal sinne, art.6.c.2.parag.2.
Impossible to be guilty of sinne, & to haue sinne forgiuen, art.4.c.1.parag.15.
Imputing of sinne what with S. Austin, art. 4.c.3.parag. 4.
not Imputation of Protestants meere contradiction, art.6.c.1.parag.4.
Inclination to faith iustifyeth infants with Bel, art.7.c.1.parag.6.
Iniquity & formal sinne differ, a.6.c.2.par.6.

Iniquitas vſed in a different ſenſe, 1. Ioan. 3. 6.c.2.parag.5.

Inuoluntary motions are not voluntary in their origin from Adam, a 4.c.1.par.11.

Inuoluntary motions though they were voluntary in their origen could be no ſinne, art.4.c.1.parag.12.

S. Ioſeph called rather keeper then husband of our Lady, art.3.c.1. parag. 11.

S. Ireney his high account of the Romane Church, art.7.c.10.parag.4.

Italy not al poſſeſſed of Barbars from 471. til Carolus Magnus, art. 1. chap. 8. parag. 5.

Iuſtice of man how imperfect, art. 5. chap. 5. parag. 3.

K.

KEepers of the commandements auouched more then twenty tymes in one pſalme, art.8.c.1.parag.5.

Kings of Lombardy called Kings of Italy, art.1.c.9.parag.7.

Kings not ſo much as miniſterial heads of the Church with Proteſtãts, a.1.c.2.par.1.

L.

OVr Ladies conception without ſinne no point of faith, art.7.c.10.par.19.

Latin ſermons not readde to common people, art.7.c.8.parag.4.

Law of the Ghoſpel includeth law of nature,

XUM

ture, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 10.
Law fulfilled by not consenting to Concupiscence, art. 4. c. 3. parag. 6.
Lay men when and how forbidden to dispute of faith, art. 7. c. 8. parag 4.
Lent an Apostolical Tradition, art. 7. c. 10. parag. 5. 6.
Lent fast lawfully broken in diuers cases, art. 7. c. 10. parag. 6.
Loue of God as we ought, possible to men, art. 8. c. 1. parag. 10.
Loue of God how imperfectly kept according to S. Thomas, art. 8. c. 2. parag. 3.
Luther begun Protestantisme, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 16.
Luther instructed of a Diuel by his owne confession, art. 2. c. 1. parag. 2.
Luther hated the word *homousion*, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 5.
Luther conuinced by Scripture to confesse the real presence, art. 2. c. 2. parag. 1.
Lutherans opinions of the Caluinists, art. 2. c. 1 parag. 10.

M.

MAriage broken for six causes, amongst Protestants, art 3. c. 1. parag. 3.
Mariage contracted why it can not be broken by the parties, art. 3. c. 1 parag. 10.
Mariage a sacrament before consummatiõ, art. 3. c. 1. parag. 8.

Mariage contracted is *de iure diuino* and of the continuance thereof, a.3. c.1 parag.6.
Mariage perfected by consummation, art. 2. c.1.parag. 8.
Masse honored in the whole world, art. 2. c. 3. parag. 5.
Masse said of the Apostles, and Saints, art. 2.c.2.parag. 4.
Men rather do not, then do, what is against their wil, art.4 c.2.parag 4.
Mental sinners but not deadly, a 8 c.2.par.4.
Men can be without cryme not without sinne, art.8.c.1.parag 2.
Merit far different from impetration, art.5. c.3.parag.2.
Merit no more iniurious to Christs merit then prayer to his prayer, a 5 c 3 parag. 8.
Merit why no sinne out of S. Austin, art. 4. c. 2. parag. 4.
Merit in resisting Concupiscence, art 4. c. 1. parag 13.
Ministers subscribe against their conscience, art. 1 c. 2. parag. 2.
More requireto formal sinne then to euil, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 4.
Mortal, & venial sinns such of their owne nature, art. 6. c. 1. parag. 2.

N.

Nicholas 1. words of earthly & heauenly empire expounded, a.1.c.9.par.14.

Not

Not only predeſtinate do good, art. 5. c. 2. parag. 3.
None ought to deny any point of faith, art. 7 c. 1 parag. 1.
Not to perfect good is not to ſinne, art. 4. c. 3. parag. 5.

O.

Old Romane religion Catholik, ſound and pure, art. 6. c. 2. parag. 8.
Omiſſion, or alteration what doth hinder conſecration, art. 2. c. 6 parag 8.
Original iuſtice what it is, a. 4. c. 1 parag. 2.
Original ſinne what, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 2
Original luſt made actual by Bel, art. 4. c. 3. parag. 7.

P.

S. Paul how he vnderſtood the worde (beſide) Galat. 11. v. 2. a 7 c. 11. parag. 5.
S. Paul loc. cit. meant of his preaching not of Scripture, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 6
S. Paul might haue called glory a ſtipend, art. 5. c. 4. parag 2.
S Paul Rom. 7 explicated. a. 4 c. 2 per tot.
S. Paul Rom 8 explicated, a. 5. c. 4. par. 10.
Pelagians thought knowledge of Scripture neceſſary to euery one, art. 7. c. 1 par. 3.
Pelagians licenced wemen to be skilful in Scripture & to ſing with them, a 7. c. 7. parag 13.
Peoples owing no obediēce to euil Princes

no doctrin of Catholiks, art.1.c.9.par.4.
S. Policarps account of the Popes sentence art.7.c.10. parag.4.
Popes accounted loyal excommunicated Emperors, art.1.c.5.parag.4.
Pope as Pope challengeth no royal right to ether sword, art.1.c.9.parag.12.
Pope can not depose Princes ordinarily euen for iust causes, art.1.c.1.par.5.6.
Pope can not depose princes for his pleasure, art.1.c.1.parag.5.
Popes and Protestants proceedings in deposing Princes compared, a.1.c.9.par.16.
Pope cold not become Antichrist by the acceptance of the Exarchate, a.1.c.9. par.4.
Pope as Pope hath no temporal iurisdiction at al, art.1 c.1. parag.4.
Popes confirmation by Emperors when it began, and when it left, a 1 c.8. par.8.
Pope hath censured al that molest our King art.1.c.4.parag.6.
Pope did neuer challeng power proper or equal to God, art.1.c.7.parag.5.
Pope how he is said to haue more then humain power, art.1.c.7 parag.3.
Pope how he may be called King of Kings, art.1.c.7.parag.6.
Pope how he may he King now though he were not in Pepins tyme, art.1.c.9.par.8.
Pope highly esteemed by S. Bernard, art.1. chap.

XUM

chap. 7. parag. 6.
Popes ſentence highly eſteemed by S. Hierom, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 1. and by others, ibid. c. 10. parag. 4.
Popes definitiue ſentence a rule of faith in S. Cyprians tyme, art. 7. c. 14. parag. 1.
Pope neuer diſpenſed to mary a ful ſiſter, art. 3. c. 1. parag. 13.
Pope in Councel as King in parlament, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 8.
Popes haue giuen three Kingdoms to England, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 17.
Popes liberality to Chriſtian Princes, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 37.
Popes moſt cruelly handled by Chriſtian princes, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 27.
Popes might haue apoſtatated from faith & yet not taught hereſy, art. 7. c. 10. par. 9.
Popes name euer from the Apoſtles tyme, art. 1. c. 5. parag. 6.
Popes neuer apoſtated in hart, a. 7. c. 10. par. 9.
Popes not prowde in mainteining their dignity, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 5.
Popes or princes of what nothing they can make ſomthing, art. 1. c. 9. parag. 29.
Popes or princes of what things they can alter the nature, art. 1. c. 9 parag. 28.
Popes true ſtep to his primacy, a. 1. c. 9. par. 31.
Pope nether ſpiritual nor temporal ſuperior to al princes on earth, a. 1. c. 1. par. 3. 4.

Popes primacy acknowledged by Grecian Emperors, Councels, and Patriarchs, art. 7.c.13.parag 6.
Popes priuate doctrin may be examined but not his iudicial sentence of faith, art.7.c. 14. parag. 2.
Popes present in most Councels of the west art.7.c.13.parag 8.
Popes taught alwaies the doctrin of S. Peter, art.7.c.10.parag.8.
Pope translated the Empire, and appointed the Electors, art.1.c.6.parag.3.4.
Popery confessed to haue bene with in 200. years after Christ, art.7.c.10.parag.2.
Prayers in an vnknowne tong commended by S.Paul, art.7.c.8 parag.2.
Princes absolute haue no temporal superior, art.1.c.1.parag 4.
Princes deposed by Prophets, a.1.c 5.par.3.
Protestants admit Tradition, a.7.c.9.par.11.
Protestants haue no reason to admit one tradition, & no more, art.7.c.9. par.11.
Protestants arrogate more power and authority then the Pope, a.1.c.7 par.3.
Protestants cal Catholiques Papists and Popish of the Pope yet wil not cal him Pope, art.1.c.5.parag.5.
Protestants censure of the communion booke, art.1.c.6 parag.10.
Protestants contradictions about the Eucharist,

chariſt, art.2.c.6. parag. 11.
Proteſtants innumerable explication, of fower words, art.2.c.6.parag 7.
Proteſtants iudgment of Fathers when they are againſt them, art.5.c.4 parag.5.
Proteſtants diſſentions touched in the late conference, art.4.c.4 parag.7.
Proteſtants enemity to good workes by word and deed, art.5.c 1.parag 2.3.
Proteſtants frendship to euil works, Ibid. parag.3.
Proteſtants had the bible from Catholiques and how, art.7.c.9.parag. 9.
Proteſtants in 70. years haue attempted to depoſe 10. princes, art.1.c.4 parag 6.
Proteſtants haue murdered diuers princes, art.1.c.4.parag.6.
Proteſtants haue burnt two Kings bodies, Ibid.
Proteſtants abuſe princes, art.1 c.9.par.31.
Proteſtants make and vnmake Emperors as they liſt, art.1.c.6 parag.3.
Proteſtants opinion of depoſing princes, art.1 c.3 per tot.
Proteſtants and the Popes depoſing princes compared, art.1.c.4.parag 6.
Proteſtants opinion of princes ſupremacy, art.1.c.2.parag.1.2.
Proteſtants and Catholiques opinion about ſupremacy compared, ibid.parag.3.

Prote-

Protestants make their professed enemyes papists, art.7.c.1.parag.13.
Protestants manner of answering Catholiques, art.1.c.6.parag.1.
Protestants new light, art.1.c.6.parag.9.
Protestants ouerthrow their owne arguments against Tradition, art.7.c.9 par.11.
Protestants persuade to read Scripture as the serpent to eate the apple, art. 7. c. 7. parag. 2.
Protestants good by english bibles, art. 7. c. 8. parag. 1.
Protestants promise with Manichees vndoubted truth for to ouerthrow authority, art.7.c.9.parag.23.
Protestants teach doctrin of Diuels, art. 2. c.1.parag.1.2.3.
Protestants try deuine truth, a.7 c.12.par.4.
Protestant wemen preached publikly in Germany, art.7. c. 13.
Puritans subscribe to the communion book only in respect of tyme, art.1.c.2.par.2.
Puritans vrge the supremacy only for pollicy, art. 1. c. 2. parag. 2.

Q.

Q. Elizabeths affiance in Catholiques fidelity, art.1.c.4.parag.4.

R.

Reading of Scripture not debarred from the godly, art.7.c.7. parag.3.

Reading

Reading or hearing Gods worde without vnderſtanding, of great effect, ibid.
Reading of Scripture not neceſſary nor expedient to al, art.7.c.7.parag.1. 2.
Real preſence proued out of Scripture and Fathers, art.2.c.1.parag 7.8.
Reaſon not to be ſought in Gods workes, art.2.c.1.parag.11.
Remaining of ſinne what it is,a.4.c.1.p.16.
Reprobats not al poſitiuely damned for original ſinne, art.4 c.2.parag.6.
Reprobats how may be ſaid to be damned for original ſinne, art.4 c.2 parag.6.
Reinolds proofe againſt him ſelfe, art 7.c. 3. parag. 3.
Royal power far inferior to Pontifical, art. 1. c.9.parag.31.
Rome the top of high preiſthood, art. 7. c. 13. parag. 6.
Romane religion aboue a thowſand years agoe out of Bel, art.7.c.10.parag.9.
Romane Church alwaies kept the Apoſtles Traditions.
Rule of trying truth preſcribed by the Councel of Trent, art.7.c.12.parag.4.

S.

SAbbath tranſlation not warrented by Scripture, art.7.c.1.parag.9.
Sabbath tranſlation warrented by Tradition, art.7.c.9.parag.4.

Sacrament of Eucharist improperly called Christs body, art.2.c.4.parag.14.
B. Sacrament both a sacrifice and a testament, art.2 c.4.parag.6.
Sacrifice requireth not killing,a.2.c 3 par 8.
Sacrificing of flesh by Priests hands allowed by Bel, art.2 c.4.parag 13.
no Sacriledge to dispute o. the Popes power, art.1 c 9 parag 34.
Sadduces erred for ignorance both of Scripture and Gods power, art.7 c.11.par 3.
Salomon deposed not Abiathar, art. 1. c. 5. parag. 10.
Samuel cold not discerne Gods word from mans word but by Holy his teach n,,art, 7. c. 9. parag. 13.
Saints honor, an Apostolical Tradition,art. 7 c. 10 parag 11.
Satisfaction suppoteth remission of sinns, art. 5. c 6. parag. 5.
Search the Scripturs explicated, art. 7. c. 11. parag 3.
Scripturs, and the Churches authority differ, art. 7. c. 9. parag. 23.
Scripture beleeued both for Gods, and the Churches testimony, art.7.c.9.par.18.
Scripture how of it selfe worthy of credit, art. 7.c.9.parag.18.
Scripture the storehouse of truth, art. 7. c. 5. parag. 1.

Scripture hath al points actually to be beleeued of euery one, art.7.c 1.parag 2.
Scripture conteineth virtually not actually al points of Christian faith, art. 7. c. 1. parag. 7. 9.
Scripture can not sufficiently & immediatly proue al points of faith, a.7 c 1.par.10.
Scripture how able to make men wise to saluation, art.7.c.3 parag.8.
Scripture no poison but food of life, art. 7. c.7.parag.18.
Scripture easy in things necessary to euery ones saluation, art 7. c.6.parag.1.
Scripture absolutly hard, ibid.
Scripture more in sense then in words, art. 7. c 9. parag. 14
Scripture not so clearly discerned as light from darknes, art.7.c.9. parag. 15.
Scripture why called a lanthorne or light, art.7.c.9.parag.17.
Scripture vulgar reading, what monsters it hath bred in England, art.7.c.7.parag 2.
Seruice of God in the old law some tyme nether heard nor seene of the people, art. 7. c. 8 parag. 3.
Seruice in an vnknowne tong discommended only of idiots, and infidels, art. 7. c. 8. parag 2.
Sinne habitual what it is, art 4 c.1.parag.3.
Sinne some of it nature breaketh frendship with

with God, some not, art. 6. c. 1. par. 6.
Sinne ordinarily taken only for mortal, art. 6. c. 2. parag. 1.
Socrates his error, art. 7. c. 10 parag. 5.
S. Steeuen P. defined not the controuersy about rebaptization, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 1.
Superior and inferior not contradictions but relatiues, and may be verifyed of the same thing, art. 1. c. 6. parag. 2.

T.

S. Thomas how he called our keeping the commandements imperfect, art. 8. c. 2. parag. 3.
Traditions of three kinds, art. 7. chap. 9. parag. 1.
Traditions which impugned by Bel, ibid. which defended in this booke, ibid.
Traditions ther are conteining things necessary to saluation, art. 7. c. 9. par. 1.
Traditions how they are explications of the law, art. 7. c. 2. parag. 4.
Tradition admitted by Bel, art. 7. chap. 9. parag. 8.
Traditions how they are additions to Scripture how not, art. 7. c. 2. parag. 3. 4.
Traditions apostolical, certain and vndoubted, art. 7. c. 10. parag. 1.
Traditions Apostolical not to be examined by Scripture, art. 7. c. 11 parag. 1..
Traditions how they may be examined by the

the Church, art.7.c.11. parag. 1.
Traditions how to be examined out of Tertullian, art. 7. c.11.parag 1.
Traditions auouched by the Fathers, art. 7. c. 4. per tot.
Traditions defended by S.Paul, and S.Ihon art. 7.c.9.parag. 1. 2.
Traditions in S. Cyprians daies sufficient proofe of doctrin, art.7.c.12.parag.1.
Tradition of Easter certein, a.7.c.10. par. 3.
Tradition of as equal force to piety as Scripture, art.7.c.4 parag.13. 14.
Tradition reiected by old heretiks, art. 7. c. 4. parag. 1.
Treason disannulleth not the gift, art. 1. c. 6 parag. 3.
Truth euidently knowne, to be preferred before authority, art.7.c.5.parag.23.
Truth what and how to be tryed, art. 7. c. 12. parag. 4.

V.

VAlew of the Masse, art.2.c.4.parag. 9.
Variety of fasting lent rose of ignorance or negligence, art.7.c. 10. par. 5.
Venial sinns admitted by Bel, art. 6. chap. 1. parag. 1.
Venial sinne why not against the law, art. 6. c. 1. parag. 8.
Venial sinne such of his nature, art. 6. c. 1. parag. 2.

Volun-

Voluntary in the origen what it is, art. 4. c. 1. parag. 11.

Voluntary motion of euil why expresly forbidden in the tenth commandement, art. 4. c. 3. parag. 10.

Vse and abuse of a thing to be distinguished, art. 7. c. 10. parag. 11.

W.

VVItnesses sufficient of Gods truth by what made, art. 7. chap. 9. parag. 6.

Wemen ought to be instructed of men, art. 7. c. 7. paragr. 5.

Wemen may teach in case of necessity or perticuler inspiration, art. 7. chap. 7. parag 13.

Words of consecration when and how they worke their effect, a. 2. c. 6 parag 5.

Worshipping an vnconsecrated host vpon ignorance no offence, art. 2 c. 6. par. 8.

Wiats rebellion defended and praised by Protestants, art. 1. c. 3. parag. 6.

X.

X*Arisma* wel translated by grace, art. 5. c. 4. parag. 4.

FINIS.

XUM